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: 11/18/2025

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 alleged on October 16th, 2025, when the Respondent Officer (RO1) took a report, by phone, regarding criminal harassment she was enduring, RO1 was unprofessional and rude by lecturing her about not reporting the incident sooner to police and insinuating the situation was her fault.

The complainant further alleged RO1 was presumptuous about her gender and did not take into account that she is a member of the LGBTQ+ community and her safety was in danger.

The complainant further alleged RO1 refused her any help, forgot things she said immediately after being told them, took poor notes of the phone call causing the complainant to have to recount all the horrible details over and over again.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation 1 – CONDUCT UNDERMINES PUBLIC TRUST – Section 10(1)

Decision and Reasons

Investigation revealed the conversation between the complainant and RO1 was on an unrecorded phone line, therefore, there was no verbatim account of the phone call.

RO1 admitted to asking direct questions to the the complainant to gather sufficient information to prepare a general occurrence report and to provide an accurate timeline of events since the alleged harassment began four months prior.

RO1 denied he was rude or dismissive towards the complainant. RO1 submitted a detailed general occurrence report, provided the complainant with a secure link to upload videos and photos and also provided the complainant with advice regarding her safety.

Once assigned the general occurrence report, WO1 conducted an audio recorded interview with the complainant, in which he asked similar questions of the complainant that RO1 had asked. The complainant did not react negatively to WO1's questions and made no mention of any concerns she had with RO1.

The complainant chose not to participate in the complaint process.

The investigation determined the allegation was unsubstantiated.