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: 03/05/2026

Type of Investigation:

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

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

On Wednesday, March 4, 2026, Police attended a 9-1-1 Disturbance call, after a neighbour heard screaming coming from the complainant's apartment residence.

Upon arriving, Police were denied entry by the complainant who attempted to close the door. An officer placed her foot in the doorway to avoid it closing, then explained the lawful meaning of 'exigent circumstances'. To placate the complainant, the officer requested a sergeant attend to avoid escalating the situation.

While waiting for the sergeant's arrival, the complainant initiated discussion with officers regarding his citizenship status. The complainant believed officers' responses were racist and discriminatory in nature. The complainant also alleged that officer made threats to break down his door.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation 1 – O. REG. 407/23 – 5 (1)
5. (1) A police officer shall not, in the course of their duties, treat any person in a manner that the officer, at the time, knows or reasonably ought to know would contravene the Human Rights Code.
(2) A police officer shall not be subject to discipline for a contravention of subsection (1) if the police officer demonstrates, on a balance of probabilities, that their conduct was in the good faith performance of their duties.

Decision and Reasons

Allegation 1

While waiting for a sergeant's arrival, the complainant and two officers engaged in conversation regarding lawful entry, and citizenship status. At no time, while reviewing the body worn camera interaction, did Police insult the complainant, disparage his citizenship status, treat him in a discriminatory manner or advise him to leave Canada. The complainant made comments that he wished Canada would be the 51st state, he was an American citizen and he liked America better. One officer reiterated to the complainant that Canada is for everyone and people can come and go as they please.

Conclusion: Reasonable grounds to believe that no Human Rights violations were made by Police against the complainant and the allegation is unsubstantiated.