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: 03/10/2026

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 exited was aggressive and used insulting language.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation #1- Interactions with the Public, Section 12. (1)

• It is alleged that the Respondent Officer was verbally abusive to the Complainant. Respondent Officer 1 (RO1

Allegation #2: Integrity, Section 16(1)

• It is alleged that the Respondent Officer used his position to attempt to influence how the

Decision and Reasons

RO1 confirmed these details in his statement and stated that he did question the Complainant about alcohol consumption. Although these allegations were made, the Complainant confirmed that RO1 mentioned that no uniform police will be attending to follow up with these allegations before they left the collision scene. The two had interacted for approximately 15-20 minutes in total. RO1 confirmed in his statement that he ultimately determined that he had no concerns or grounds to believe that the Complainant had been drinking and did not request a uniform police vehicle to investigate further.

Allegations were made by the Complainant about the way RO1 wanted to deal with the reporting of the collision and involvement of their respective insurance companies. The Complainant confirmed in his statement that RO1 made no comments about a monetary figure for damage or requested or demanded cash for repairs when discussing the damage, or reporting the matter to their respective automobile insurance companies.

The Complainant stated that RO1 was very aggressive. The Complainant in his statement however made no allegations that RO1 made any offensive remarks or swore at the Complainant during the interaction, after the two had exited their respective vehicles, after the initial allegation that RO1 gave the Complainant the finger prior to the collision. The RO stated they honked horns and he gestured to the Complainant with his hand out the window as to what are you doing?

The interaction ended when at least some information was exchanged, as required under the Highway Traffic Act Section 200 Duty of Person in Charge of Vehicle in Case of Accident, between the two before they left the scene, in that they exchanged Ontario driver's licence information and phone numbers. Subsequent interaction between the two was limited to text message only, when the Complainant failed to provide his insurance information, as agreed, and RO1 was forced to reach out to him for the information.

Finding: The Complainant and RO1 were involved in a minor traffic collision. There is insufficient evidence to support the allegations of misconduct made against RO1. It is alleged that the