

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: [REDACTED]

Date of Complaint: 01/19/2026

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 alleges that the officers refused to investigate her reports. The officers reacted with hostility, wrongfully arrested and charged the complainant. The complainant further alleges that the officers mocked her, dismissed her evidence, behaved unprofessionally.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation 1 – Conduct Undermines Public Trust Section 10(1) CSPA Ontario Regulation 407/23
A police officer shall not conduct themselves in a manner that undermines, or is likely to undermine, public trust in policing.

Allegation 2 – Insulting Language or Abuse Section 12(1) CSPA Ontario Regulation 407/23
A police officer shall not, in the course of their duties, use abusive language with any person or otherwise treat any person in a manner that is abusive.

Allegation 3 – Neglects to do Duty Section 19 CSPA Ontario Regulation 407/23

Decision and Reasons

In each of the allegations, the versions of the complainant compared to the officers' explanations were very conflictual. In the first allegation of 'Neglect of Duty', as per case law "PG vs Police Complaints Commissioner", two situations are required to establish Neglect of Duty:

- 1) There was some element of willingness; in the officer's neglect; or
- 2) There was a degree of neglect which would make the matter cross the line from mere performance consideration to a matter of misconduct.

In this situation, with the conflicting evidence, the investigator was unable to meet either requirement to establish Neglect of Duty.

In the second allegation of "Insulting Language or Abuse" the involved officers were adamant that the complainant's allegation of the "rolling of the eyes", and the unprofessional comment of "I have good news and bad news", were simply fabricated and untrue. The witness officers also corroborated the involved officers' testimony as there were never any observations made of the "rolling of the eyes", and no recollection of the unprofessional comment being made at any time. The threshold of 'clear and convincing evidence' could not be met, therefore, the allegation of 'Insulting language or Abuse' could not be substantiated.

The third allegation of 'Conduct Undermines Public Trust', the threshold again could not be met with the conflicting evidence gathered from the complainant and the involved officers. Also, in Paul Ceyssen's "Legal Aspects of Policing" (2002), he refers to the fact the law is well settled in this regard. He quotes the Ontario Tribunal, "the measure used to determine whether conduct has been discreditable is the extent of the potential damage to the reputation and image of the Service should the action become public". There was not enough evidence to meet the threshold of 'clear and convincing evidence' to substantiate this allegation.