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

A public complaint was filed regarding police conduct during an intimate partner violence (IPV) investigation and subsequent enforcement actions in 2024. The complaint alleged misconduct by two officers in relation to the arrest and handling of an accused individual and administrative procedures connected to bail conditions.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Integrity-Use Position - Sec 16 CSPA Reg. 407/23

Public-Unlawful Arrest - Sec 7 CSPA Reg. 407/23

Public-Undermine Public Trust - Sec 10 CSPA Reg. 407/23

Duty-Mislead - Sec 31 CSPA Reg. 407/23

Decision and Reasons

Integrity-Use Position - Sec 16 CSPA Reg. 407/23 - Investigator reviewed officer notes, duty reports, interview statements, witness statements regarding relationships and workplace connections and occurrence reports outlining investigative roles and decision-making. No evidence supported a personal relationship or improper influence. The officer's involvement was operational and appropriate.

Unlawful Arrest - Sec 7 CSPA Reg. 407/23 - Investigator reviewed occurrence reports and officer notes related to the compliance check; statements from involved officers; audio recordings of communications during the incident; bail conditions and release order documentation; draft Feeney warrant materials; court transcripts and Crown correspondence explaining the later withdrawal of the charge. The arrest was based on reasonable grounds at the time, despite the later withdrawal of the charge due to legal ambiguity.

Undermine Public Trust - Sec 10 CSPA Reg. 407/23: Investigator reviewed the audio recordings of phone conversations provided by the complainant; officer notes documenting communications; witness and officer interview statements; occurrence reports detailing investigative steps and rationale; communications were consistent with lawful police duties. Statements perceived as threats reflected explanations of legal authority and were not improper.

Misleading / Documentation - Sec 31 CSPA Reg. 407/23: Investigator reviewed statements from the witnessing officer; statement from the civilian participant involved in the process; occurrence records confirming the bail variation and requirement for the document; context of standard administrative practices for such forms. The officer's witnessing of a document reflected an administrative misunderstanding rather than intentional deception or misconduct.

All allegations were determined to be unsubstantiated. The investigation concluded that police actions were lawful, reasonable, and consistent with applicable standards, with no evidence of misconduct.