

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: 06/02/2026

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service: ☒

Referred to Other Service: ☐

Retained by LECA: ☐

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

The responding officer rented a condo from the complainant for approximately 10 months outside of the City ██████████

The complainant alleged that the responding officer threatened to damage his property after being locked out of his rental unit and that this entire incident caused them significant distress and anxiety

The complainant further alleged that the responding officer used his ██████████ Police Service email account including his rank, title, badge number, and digital signature and that it could reasonably be perceived as intimidating.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation 1 – Undermine Public Trust Section 10 Community Safety and Policing Act (CSPA)
You are alleged to have committed misconduct in that, you conducted yourself in a manner that undermined, or was likely to undermine, public trust in policing.

It is alleged that the responding officer engaged with the complainant in a manner that caused them significant distress and anxiety, including a fear of reprisal. It is further alleged that the responding officer threatened to breach the door to gain entry to the rental unit from which they had been locked out.

Decision and Reasons

Allegation 1 – Undermine Public Trust Section 10 Community Safety and Policing Act (CSPA)
You are alleged to have committed misconduct in that, you conducted yourself in a manner that undermined, or was likely to undermine, public trust in policing.

A review was conducted of the responding officers duty report, the recorded phone conversation with the complainant, all email correspondence provided by [REDACTED] IT/responding officer, as well as text messages.

During a heated exchange, the responding officer did state that he would break into his own place which he later stated was lawful.

After reviewing all evidence there is no evidence that the responding officer used his position, rank, or authority to influence the tenancy dispute or intimidated the complainant. The responding officers conduct occurred as a tenant and at no time used his position as a police officer for any gain. The responding officer's tone, words and electronic signature do not meet the threshold for misconduct. At no point did the responding officer threaten the complainant or make any threat of retribution outside of the Landlord Tenant Tribunal

Allegation 2 – Improper Use of Position Section 16(1) CSPA

You are alleged to have committed misconduct in that, you used your position as a police officer to benefit yourself, or one or more persons with whom you have a personal relationship with or interfered with the administration of justice.

After reviewing all evidence there is no evidence that the responding officer used his position, rank, or authority to influence the tenancy dispute or intimidated the complainant. The responding officers conduct occurred as a tenant and at no time used his position as a police officer for any gain. The responding officer's tone, words and electronic signature do not meet the threshold for [REDACTED]