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: 12/09/2025

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 attended the provincial offences court office . The complainant ' s mother attended the front desk counter to contest a parking ticket she had received. The clerk at the counter asked the complainant to leave the building. The complainant did not leave. The respondent officer arrested the complainant and escorted him outside.

Further, the RO was unprofessional, hostile and dismissive toward the complainant.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Section 7 - Unlawful arrest
Section 12 - Insulting language
Section 13(1) - Conceal identifying information

Decision and Reasons

The complainant was loud, disruptive, and argumentative during his interaction with the courthouse employee. The complainant was asked by the courthouse staff to leave the premises due to his behavior. The complainant refused to leave. Moreover, the complainant made a statement he would only leave if arrested. The complainant was in contravention of Ontario trespass to property act, section 2(1)(b). The RO arrested the complainant and escorted him outside. The arrest was deemed lawful and section 7 was unsubstantiated.

The RO placed the handcuff on the complainant, escorted him outside, and released him from custody almost immediately. The complainant was in detention for a total duration of two to three minutes. The RO did not read the complainant his Rights to Counsel, as the act of reading the rights would only prolong the physical detention of the complainant. The arrest served the function of removing the complainant from the courthouse, rather than as an act of prolong custody. No misconduct found in RO's omission of Rights to Counsel in this circumstance.

The RO denied making any inappropriate remarks and stated she conducted herself professionally throughout the interaction. In the absence of corroborating evidence, the investigation was unable to conclude, on a balance of probabilities, that the RO used abusive or insulting language or otherwise treated the complainant or CW1 in a manner that breached the Code of Conduct. Accordingly, section 12 allegation was unsubstantiated.

The RO was wearing a visible name tag during the interaction with the complainant. The complainant's mother wrote RO's name and badge number on her phone. The RO spelled her name out for the complainant's mother, and watched her enter her name. Section 13(1) was thus unsubstantiated.