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: 11/18/2025

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 alleged the officer failed to properly identify himself, seized her mobile phone without lawful authority, and used force during the interaction. The complainant further raised concerns regarding discrimination, procedural fairness, and the conduct of both the officer and hospital staff during the incident.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

CSPA O. Reg. 407/23 sec. 05 - Discrimination under the Human Rights Code
CSPA O. Reg. 407/23 sec. 10 - Conduct that undermines public trust
CSPA O. Reg. 407/23 sec. 11 - Unnecessary force
CSPA O. Reg. 407/23 sec. 15 - Fail to identify / Conceal identity
CSPA O. Reg. 407/23 sec. 19 - Neglects to do duty

Decision and Reasons

CSPA O. Reg. 407/23 sec. 05 - Discrimination under the Human Rights Code
The allegation of discrimination based on disability, ethnicity, gender, or language was assessed. The body worn camera video does not demonstrate differential treatment linked to any protected ground. The respondent officer’s actions were in response to the complainant’s behaviour, specifically the refusal to comply with hospital policy and directions, rather than to any personal characteristics. The directions provided to the complainant were consistent with those given by hospital staff and which are applied uniformly to all patients. There is no evidence of discriminatory remarks, gestures, or conduct by the respondent officer.

CSPA O. Reg. 407/23 sec. 10 - Conduct that undermines public trust
The respondent officer's intervention occurred only after the interaction became increasingly disruptive in the busy hospital waiting room. The video shows the respondent officer using a calm, firm, and professional tone while conveying hospital staff instructions and explaining the available options to the complainant, namely to re-register or leave the hospital. The respondent officer’s behaviour throughout the interaction are consistent with verbal de-escalation and maintaining order in a healthcare setting. There was no evidence on the recording of raised voice, threatening language, or inappropriate remarks. The respondent officer was competent and professional at all times.

CSPA O. Reg. 407/23 sec. 11 - Unnecessary force
The evidence does not support that the force used by the respondent officer was unreasonable or disproportionate. The complainant did not comply with repeated instructions to stop recording in the hospital and to release the phone. The respondent officer’s physical contact was minimal, limited to prying the complainant’s fingers from the device, and ceased immediately once the objective was achieved. No strikes, take-downs, or restraint techniques were used. The body worn camera video does not show any visible injury and the complainant did not communicate any pain or injury during the seizure of the device. There is no medical or independent evidence corroborating the complainant’s assertion of physical harm as a result of the interaction.