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: 09/24/2025

Type of Investigation:

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

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

On Sunday August 25th, 2024, the Respondent Officer (RO1) stopped and investigated the Complainant during a traffic stop .

The Complainant alleges RO1 neglected their duty, breached the Complainants Charter of Rights, targeted the Complainant because of his skin colour and age, used insulting language and that their actions undermined the public trust.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Interactions with the Public; Undermine Public Trust Section 10(1) CSPA
Human Rights and the Charter: Treat person in contravention of Human Rights Code Section 5(1)
Incivility; Used insulting language Section 12(1)
Neglect of Duty; Neglects to do duty Section 19 CSPA
Infringe or deny Charter Right; Unlawful/ Unnecessary exercise of Authority Section 6(1)

Decision and Reasons

Allegation #1

The investigation has revealed that the Respondent Officer was in the lawful performance of his duties, and acted in accordance with all governing authorities. The Complainant was investigated by the Respondent Officers as his taxicab was parked illegally. The Investigator reviewed all the available video evidence and confirmed that the Respondent Officer treated the Complainant respectfully and interacted with him in a professional manner. The Witness Officer and the available video evidence did not corroborate the Complainant's allegation that the Respondent Officer repeatedly touched his firearm. The Investigator did not observe any attempt to intimidate the Complainant by the Respondent Officer. Based on the available information, the Investigator has concluded that there is insufficient evidence to establish reasonable grounds that misconduct has occurred. Therefore, the allegation is unsubstantiated.

Allegation #2

The investigation has revealed RO1 was in the lawful performance of his duties, and acted in accordance with all governing authorities. The investigation clearly demonstrated that the Respondent Officer initiated the traffic investigation after observing that the Complainant had parked his taxicab in violation of the [Redacted] Municipal By-Law. A thorough review of all the available evidence confirmed that the Complainant was treated fairly and without bias, and the Respondent Officer acted in a professional manner throughout their interaction. Based on the available information, the Investigator has concluded that there is insufficient evidence to establish reasonable grounds that misconduct has occurred. Therefore, the allegation is unsubstantiated.

Allegation #3

The investigation revealed that RO1 was completely professional in his dealings with the Complainant. The Investigator reviewed all available video evidence and confirmed that RO1 did not use foul or inappropriate language toward the Complainant at any time. Based on the available information, the Investigator has concluded that there is insufficient evidence to establish reasonable grounds that misconduct has occurred. Therefore, the allegation is unsubstantiated.

Allegation #4