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: 01/08/2026

Type of Investigation:

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

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

The complainant alleged that police conducted a biased and inadequate investigation by relying largely on the accuser's claims, failed to pursue corroborating evidence or witnesses, and misrepresented his conduct. The complainant further claimed unprofessional behaviour by releasing private information and poor note taking, asserting that credibility issues revealed at trial exposed investigative flaws that led to the charges being dismissed.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Respondent Officer 1 (RO1)
– Neglect of Duty – Sec. 2(1)(c) PSA Reg. 268/10
– Breach of Confidence – Sec. 2(1)(e) PSA Reg. 268/10

Respondent Officer 2 (RO2)
– Neglect of Duty – Sec. 2(1)(c) PSA Reg. 268/10

Decision and Reasons

Respondent Officer 1 (RO1)
Neglect of Duty – s. 2(1)(c), PSA Reg. 268/10
The allegation that RO1 conducted a negligent, rushed, or biased investigation was determined to be unsubstantiated. Prior to arrest, RO1 gathered sufficient information to form reasonable grounds to believe the complainant had engaged in criminal conduct. Following the arrest, the investigation remained active and included the collection of additional witness statements, digital evidence, and the pursuit of judicial authorizations. RO1's investigative decisions and actions were consistent with the Criminal Code, established case law, and applicable police policies and procedures. In reaching this determination, the Professional Standards investigator reviewed witness statements, police reports, body-worn camera footage, and information obtained from the Office of the Crown Attorney.

Respondent Officer 1 (RO1)
Breach of Confidence – s. 2(1)(e), PSA Reg. 268/10
The complainant alleged that RO1 disclosed private information without authority to a member of the public during an interview. The Professional Standards investigator reviewed the interview in its entirety and determined that the alleged breach did not occur as claimed. While RO1 made a comment that when viewed narrowly and in isolation could be subject to misinterpretation. The comment did not constitute a breach of confidence when assessed in its proper context and within the full scope of the interview.

Respondent Officer 2 (RO2)
Neglect of Duty – s. 2(1)(c), PSA Reg. 268/10
The allegation against RO2 related to an off-duty interaction with the complainant. The information provided by the complainant regarding this interaction does not support a finding of misconduct. RO2's account of the interaction provided further clarification and confirmed that the conduct did not constitute neglect of duty.