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: 12/15/2025

Type of Investigation:

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

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

Complainant contacted police requesting a wellness check on her friend.
The Complainant called back three times questioning why police were not responding in an urgent matter and was upset that the police was not taking it seriously.
The police attended after the complainant had left for work.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation 1: Undermines Public Trust

Allegation 2: Neglect of Duty

CSPA O. Reg. 407/23 Code of Conduct

Decision and Reasons

From the information provided by the Complainant, there was no immediate safety concerns for the friend who had been staying with the ex-boyfriend voluntarily for months.

Considering the nature of the Complainant's concerns, that they primarily revolved around the friend attending court the next day in attempts to recant her statement, that there were no immediate, or new safety concerns raised or articulated, and the friend had been staying with the ex-boyfriend for months without any issues or concerns, the determination made by RO1 to hold the call for dayshift, as the platoon officers were consistently attending a high volume of priority calls for service does not fall under misconduct.