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: 01/16/2026

Type of Investigation:

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

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

On November 11, 2025, the Complainant filed a report with the Police Service alleging a few offences, that occurred in different jurisdictions, involved multiple offenders, on multiple dates.

The report was assigned to the Respondent Officer.

The Complainant alleges that the Respondent Officer failed to investigate any of the matters and was discriminatory based on his race.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

s.19 Neglect of duty
s. 5 Treat person in contravention of the Human Rights Code

Decision and Reasons

Neglect of Duty
Section 19. A police officer shall not, by act or omission, fail to perform their duties appropriately without lawful excuse if, at the time, they know or reasonably ought to know that their act or omission would amount to a failure to perform their duties appropriately.

Finding: The evidence establishes that the Respondent Officer reviewed the assigned occurrence, attempted to contact the Complainant to obtain clarification, and documented his actions. The investigation could not be advanced due to the Complainant's behavior and failure to provide necessary information, not due to any lack of diligence, willfulness, or neglect on the part of the Respondent Officer. The Respondent Officer acted within his duties and in accordance with Toronto Police Service procedures and the Community Safety and Policing Act.
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.

Treat person in contravention of the Human Rights Code
Section 5. 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.

Finding: Although race is a protected ground under the Human Rights Code, there is no objective evidence that the Respondent Officer's actions or decisions were influenced by race or any other protected characteristic. The closure of the occurrence was based on insufficient information and investigative viability, not discriminatory intent or bias. The Complainant's belief that discrimination occurred is not supported by the evidence. The Respondent Officer acted lawfully, fairly, and in compliance with the Community Safety and Policing Act and applicable human rights obligations. Based on the available information, the Investigator has concluded that there is insufficient