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: 12/11/2025

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 alleged that because he was black operating a Mercedes he was targeted. The officer followed the complainant and ran the complainant's licence plate. Once the officer learned who the complainant was he pulled the complainant over. The officer demanded a driver's licence and a breath test. The officer threatened to arrest the complainant if he did not comply and searched the complainant who believed he was being harassed and targeted.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation 1 - CONDUCT UNDERMINES PUBLIC TRUST - contrary to section 10 of Ontario Regulation 407/23 and therefore, contrary to section 195(a) of the Community Safety Policing Act, R.S.O. 2019, as amended.

Allegation 2 - UNLAWFULL DETENTION - contrary to section 8(1) of Ontario Regulation 407/23 and therefore, contrary to section 195(a) of the Community Safety Policing Act, R.S.O. 2019, as amended.

Decision and Reasons

Allegation 1 – CONDUCT UNDERMINES PUBLIC TRUST – Unsubstantiated

The respondent officer was assigned as to directed patrol that is responsible for policing high crime areas, traffic management and impaired driving initiatives. The respondent officer had conducted multiple traffic stops throughout his shift in relation to his assignment that included breath demands to ensure that drivers were not impaired. The respondent officer conducted a lawful traffic stop involving the complainant with no evidence of targeting the complainant. The complainant was given a lawful demand for a breath test.

Allegation 2 - UNLAWFUL DETENTION- Unsubstantiated

The respondent officer conducted a lawful traffic stop and made a lawful breath demand during the interactions between the officer and complainant. The complainant was lawfully detained.

Allegation 3 - BREACH OF CHARTER - Unsubstantiated

The complainant was lawfully detained and was patted down by the officer for officer safety during the breath test. As per case law, R vs Mann, a non-evasive pat down is authorized when there are reasonable grounds to ensure officer safety.