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: 01/15/2026

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 Respondent Officer #1 neglected their duty by not fully investigating an assault allegation. The complainant believed that the officer should have been able to make an arrest.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Respondent Officer #1
- By act or omission, failed to perform duties appropriately without lawful excuse - sec 19 CSPA Reg. 407/23

Decision and Reasons

Respondent Officer #1 attended the complainant's location and took all the appropriate investigative steps. Respondent Officer #1 obtained all the necessary inforamtion to initiate an assault investigation. Respondent Officer #1 ensured the complainant was cared for as they offered medical assistance, Victim Services and went through a safety plan.

Respondent Officer #1 attended attended several locations to canvass for video and witnesses, which resulted in several videos and pictures of the suspect being uploaded as evidence. Suspect photos were disseminated to police to identify the unknown suspect with negative results. The case was suspended.

Investigation revealed that Respondent Officer #1 made all the appropriate investigative steps in an effort to identify the suspect. There was no evidence to suggest that Respondent Officer #1 neglected their duty as a police officer in this investigation.