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: 02/23/2026

Type of Investigation:

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

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

The allegations stem from the officer's investigation into a criminal harassment call for service reported by Civilian Witnesses. The Civilian Witnesses identified the two Complainants as subjects of that investigation. The Respondent Officer attended the call for service, conducted the initial investigation, made efforts to caution the Complainants and documented the results in a (redacted) occurrence report.

The Complainant alleges that the Respondent Officer failed to thoroughly investigate the Civilian Witness's initial criminal allegation before cautioning Complainant #1 for criminal harassment. Furthermore, Complainant #1 claims the officer's actions were influenced by factors protected under the Human Rights Code.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation #1 - Performance of Duties - Section 19

Allegation #2 - Human Rights and The Charter - Section 5

Decision and Reasons

Allegation #1

Finding: This investigation has revealed the officer was in the lawful performance of their duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities. The investigation has shown that there was evidence to have supported a harassment charge against the Complainant and the officer used their discretion to not proceed. Based on the available information, the Investigator has concluded that there is insufficient evidence to establish reasonable grounds that misconduct has occurred. Therefore, the allegation is unsubstantiated.

Allegation #2

Finding: This investigation has revealed the officer was in the lawful performance of their duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities. There is no evidence to support the allegation that the Respondent Officer's investigative actions were influenced by the race or sexual orientation of C1.The complainant was not denied access to services in any way bases on a protected ground. Based on the available information, the Investigator has concluded that there is insufficient evidence to establish reasonable grounds that misconduct has occurred. Therefore, the allegation is unsubstantiated.