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: OPP

Date of Complaint: 09/09/2025

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 was not staisfied with the police investigation into a child custody issue. There were three complainants regarding the custody concerns.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Duty – Trust – CSPA Section 10(1) Code of the Conduct Reg 407/23
Duty – Neglect – CSPA Section 19 Code of the Conduct Reg 407/23
Duty – Unnecessary Force – CSPA Section 11(1) Code of the Conduct Reg 407/23

Decision and Reasons

Incident One – June 20, 2025

A Superior Court granted the father interim custody of the child. The Public Complainants alleged the Respondent Officers enforced the order aggressively. The child expressed fear of her father. Officers spent hours negotiating but did not forcibly remove the child, consulted a supervisor, and left without completing the exchange. BWC footage showed officers were courteous, prioritized the child's welfare, and later notified CAS. Allegations of misconduct were unsubstantiated.

Incident Two – June 21, 2025

Officers attended the hospital to enforce the same order. The grandmother alleged officers were intimidating, mocked them and conducted a “state-based abduction.” Evidence showed officers negotiated for hours, avoided force, and did not mock the family. The evidence further confirmed the mother obstructed the custody exchange investigation. The exchange was postponed to reduce stress. Allegations were unsubstantiated.

Incident Three – June 22, 2025

At the OPP detachment, the father physically removed the child from a vehicle driven by the boyfriend. The boyfriend alleged a Respondent Officer grabbed his neck to stop him from filming and comforting the child. Evidence confirmed minimal, authorized force was used to prevent obstruction and the ensure safety of the child, while enforcing the court order. No injury occurred. Allegations were unsubstantiated.