



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: 03/11/2026

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 respondent officer unlawfully arrested and assaulted them. The complainant also alleges that they were not provided with an opportunity to speak to a supervisor at the scene of the arrest and did not receive access to lawyer despite requesting one.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation #1: Interactions with the Public - Unlawful Arrest, S. 7(1) CSPA

Allegation #2: Interactions with the Public - Unnecessary Use of Force, S. 11(1) CSPA

Decision and Reasons

An investigation revealed that the complainant walked through a closed crime scene two times, preventing the respondent officer from photographing the scene and collecting evidence for a serious motor vehicle collision investigation. The complainant refused to identify themselves when directed to and then resisted arrest for Obstruct Police.

The complainant was spoken to in person by a supervisor and was released unconditionally at the scene shortly after. The complainant was provided with information to contact a lawyer as further detention for the sole purpose of facilitating a conversation with a lawyer was deemed to be a violation of their Charter of Rights.

CONCLUSION: The Chief did not have reasonable grounds to believe that the actions of the respondent officer constituted misconduct.