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: 09/03/2025

Type of Investigation:

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

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

On July 29th, 2025, the complainant was the subject of a Mental Health Act investigation. The complainant was apprehended by members of the service at a Bank of Montreal (BMO). Police body-worn cameras captured the apprehension. Members of the service used physical control to apprehend the complainant. The complainant alleged that the officers involved used unnecessary force and that their conduct undermined public trust. He submitted a complaint to the Law Enforcement Complaints Agency (LECA), which was referred to the police service's Professional Standards Branch for investigation.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

11 unnecessary force
10 conduct undermines public trust
19 neglects to do duty

Decision and Reasons

s.11- Unnecessary force:

The concerns articulated by the Respondent Officers about the complainant's lack of compliance and escalating behaviour have been confirmed through the officers body worn cameras, and the use of force was found to be reasonable under the circumstances. The Respondents were lawfully positioned while carrying out their duty to apprehend the complainant pursuant to s.17 of the Mental Health Act. The officers were acting on reasonable grounds, and their use of force was reasonable and justified under s.25 of the Criminal Code. The force utilized was the minimum required to gain control under the circumstances, and it was found to be consistent with provincial guidelines and the officers' training. Accordingly, this allegation of misconduct was found to be unsubstantiated.

s.10- Conduct that undermines public trust:

The evidence demonstrated that the police were lawfully situated and acting in accordance with the Mental Health Act and their duties as police officers while apprehending the complainant. Some Respondent Officers were equipped with BWC's which captured the police interaction. The BWC evidence is supplemental evidence to the statements obtained during this investigation. Having reviewed the evidence, it was found that the officers had a duty to apprehend the complainant and did so using the minimum required force, specifically a grounding technique and handcuffing. The investigation revealed no evidence that the conduct of the Respondent Officers undermined or was likely to undermine public trust in policing. Accordingly, this allegation of misconduct was found to be unsubstantiated.

s.19- Neglects to do duty

It was found that the Respondents were required to perform a duty, and that they performed their duties in a prompt and diligent manner. There is no evidence to support the Complainant's allegation that the Respondent Officers were negligent in their response to the complainant's