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: 01/21/2026

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's brother was a victim of a shooting event in the [city]. The Complainant attended the hospital to be at his brother's side and was approached by the Respondent Officer. The Complainant had an interaction with the Respondent Officer, when the officer stated, "Don't do anything", which the Complainant felt was inappropriate and offensive given the circumstances.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation #1

Interactions with the Public - 10(1) A police officer shall not conduct themselves in a manner that undermines, or is likely to undermine, public trust in policing.

• It is alleged that the Respondent Officer had a conversation with the Complainant and made a comment that undermined public trust in policing.

Decision and Reasons

Allegation #1

Finding: This investigation has revealed that Respondent Officer acted in the lawful performance of his duties in accordance with all governing authorities. The Respondent Officer acknowledged that his comment was perceived as inappropriate by the Complainant. However, his intention was to reassure the Complainant and family present that the [Police Service] was treating the investigation as a priority. 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

Finding: This investigation has revealed that Respondent Officer acted in the lawful performance of his duties in accordance with all governing authorities. The Respondent Officer made a comment to the Complainant in an effort to reassure the family that the investigation into his brother's death was being treated as a priority. There was no evidence developed to confirm that the Respondent Officer's comment was motivated by the Complainant's racial background. 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.