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: 12/08/2025

Type of Investigation:

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

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

Complainant alleges that officers neglected their duty by failing to lay charges against a suspect that stole property.

Complainant believes that the Officer's response was influenced by race or ethnicity.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Neglect To Do Duty - 19 of the Code of Conduct, Ontario Regulation 407/23, Community Safety and Policing Act of Ontario.

Decision and Reasons

On November 1, 2025, the complainant alleged that Police refused to lay charges or speak with her in relation to the theft of her phone.

The call to Police was made by a third party who indicated that they required assistance to retrieve the complainant's phone. Police were advised by the third party that the complainant just wanted her phone back and was not interested in pursuing charges.

Police attended and assisted in recovering the cell phone, which was returned to the complainant by the third party. Police never interacted with the complainant, and the complainant did not contact Police until after the incident.

The respondent officer had been advised on November 10, 2025 that the complainant had called to speak with him about this incident. The respondent officer made several attempts, including contacting the third party to obtain the complainants contact number, and made multiple attempts to call the complainant, without success.

The respondent officer acted according to the information that he had at the time, and was found to have not committed any misconduct. The insinuation that the officer's actions were influenced by the complainant's ethnicity were not supported by the evidence. The officers never saw or interacted with the complainant and were unaware of her race or ethnicity at the time of the call for service.