

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: 08/28/2025

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service: ☒

Referred to Other Service: ☐

Retained by LECA: ☐

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

On August 9, 2025, police responded to an Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) incident. The complainant was reporting his ex-wife intentionally run him off the roadway.

At the conclusion of his investigation, the Respondent Officer had not formed ground for any offence under the Highway Traffic Act or the Criminal Code and provided the complainant with an update.

On August 28, 2025, the complainant filed a public complaint (LECA file [REDACTED]) alleging that the Respondent Officer failed to conduct a proper investigation by not interviewing witnesses who were present during the incident.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Duty - Neglect or Omit - Sec 19 CSPA Reg. 407/23

Decision and Reasons

The evidence shows the Respondent Officer attended the scene, obtained relevant statements, reviewed the evidence and concluded that no grounds existed for any offence. His decision not to interview the witnesses was based on his assessment that their statements would not advance the investigation. There is no indication of willful neglect or failure to perform required duties, therefore the allegation is unsubstantiated.