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:

Type of Investigation:

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

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

1. The complainant was separated from her ex-husband and they have a child in common who was six years old at the time of this incident.

2. On October 19, 2024, at shortly before 6:00pm; the complainants ex-husband dropped their daughter off at a childrens birthday party at a residence in Woodstock, ON.

3. After dropping their daughter off at the party her ex-husband returned to their residence, and he and the complainant had discussed concerns about a strong odour of marijuana emanating from within the residence where he had left their daughter. They also discussed his concerns that the occupant of the residence's boyfriend who had been present appeared to be "high".

4. They discussed what should be done and the complainant decided that her daughter should be picked up and attended the residence to remove her from the party as she was not comfortable with her being there.

5. The complainant knocked on the door and spoke with the occupant of the residence about picking her daughter up. The occupant told the complainant that she was not comfortable releasing her daughter to the complainant as it was her ex-husband that had dropped her off at the party. The occupant told the complainant that she would need to check with her ex-husband before she was willing to release her daughter to her as he was supposed to pick her up at 8:00pm. The occupant of the residence then shut and locked the door on the complainant.

6. The complainant then went back to her vehicle as she was going to call her ex-husband but ended up calling the police. The complainant then went back to the front of the residence and the occupant of the residence exited and told the complainant to leave while she was speaking on the phone with an unknown person(s). A verbal argument ensued over the release of the complainant's daughter on the front yard as the occupant of the residence accused the complainant of wanting to

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation 1 - Discrimination - Human Rights and the Charter - CSPA O.Reg 407/23 Code of Conduct

5. (1) A police officer shall not, in the course of their duties, treat any person in a manner that the officer, at the time, knows or reasonably ought to know would contravene the Human Rights Code.

Allegation 2 - Unlawful Arrest and Neglects Duty - Interactions with the Public and

Decision and Reasons

Based on the evidence obtained during the investigation and the analysis outlined above, the investigation resulted in the following findings:

Allegation 1 - Discrimination - Human Rights and the Charter - CSPA O.Reg 407/23 Code of Conduct
5. (1) A police officer shall not, in the course of their duties, treat any person in a manner that the officer, at the time, knows or reasonably ought to know would contravene the Human Rights Code.

It is alleged that the subject officer did, during the course of his duties, discriminate against the complainant for being a French speaking citizen. It is alleged that he allowed this to factor into his decision to arrest the complainant along with the fact that the occupant of the residence is a native of Woodstock, Ontario and an English-speaking citizen. It is further alleged that the subject officer intimidated the complainant for her French accent and told her that she was difficult to understand.

Conclusion:
Based on a review and analysis of all information, the investigation has determined that there is insufficient evidence to establish that misconduct occurred in relation to this arrest which would lead one to believe that any discrimination took place. The complainant was not able to give any direct examples of how the subject officer discriminated against her. Her allegation that this had occurred, stemmed from the subject officer asking her to repeat herself constantly (which in and of itself was refuted by both the subject officer and witness officer 1).

The complainant also accused the subject officer of showing favouritism to the occupant of the residence because she is from Woodstock and is English speaking however there was no evidence to support this accusation. It is evident from the subject officers statements and duty book notes that his decision to arrest the complainant was based off reasonable probable grounds