DISCLAIMER: In accordance with the *Community Safety and Policing Act* and the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, the summary below has been de-identified to remove the personal information of individuals, including public complainants and persons who were the subject of the investigation.

DE-IDENTIFIED SUMMARY UNDER SECTION 167(2) OF THE CSPA

Original Police Service:

Date of Complaint: 12/16/2025

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service: ◉ Referred to Other Service: ○ Retained by LECA: ○

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

The Complainant was investigated by officers in relation to an ongoing harassment. As part of the investigation the Respondent Officer attempted to make contact with the Complainant by calling her employer.

The Complainant alleges that the officer neglected their duties because they contacted her employer to caution her for an offence without having completed a full investigation prior to doing so.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Section 9 - Performance of Duties - Neglect of Duty

Decision and Reasons

Section 9 - Performance of Duties - Neglect of Duty - Unsubstantiated

The Complainant states that a (Redacted) Police Service officer failed to properly investigate a harassment claim and that the officer had no grounds to contact her employer in an attempt to caution her for an offence. The Complainant states that this interaction has lead to her suffering negative consequences in the workplace.

The Investigating officer found that there were reasonable and probable ground to support a charge of harassment against the Complainant and that the Respondent Officer was justified is issuing her a caution. Further, the Investigating officer found that at no time during the interaction with the Complainant's employer did the officer say that she was suspected of a crime and would be cautioned, the officer only asked for contact information.