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

The Complainant (Compl) submitted a complaint that alleged that the Respondent Officers (RO1 an RO2) unlawfully arrested him and neglected their duty. He alleged that the criminal charges brought against him lacked validity, citing their subsequent dismissal by the Crown.

RO1 and RO2 investigated an assault incident on May 20, 2025. A landlord reported that after providing proper notice as per the Residential Tenancies Act, she had entered the Compl's apartment to conduct annual fire alarm testing. Once inside the residence, the Compl became argumentative, grabbed her by the arm and pushed her out of the apartment. RO1 and RO2 took statements from the involved parties, reviewed the entry notice, took evidentiary photographs and formed reasonable grounds to believe that the Compl had committed assault. At a later date, he was arrested and charged. He was released on a Form 10 with conditions. The Crown ultimately withdrew the charges because it was determined there was no reasonable prospect of conviction. The Crown applies a higher evidentiary standard in determining whether there is a reasonable prospect of conviction. Although the Crown determined the likelihood of conviction was insufficient to proceed, it was appropriate for police to lay the charge based on the information available to them at the time.

PSU investigated the incident and concluded the allegations of undermining public trust in policing and neglect to do duty were unsubstantiated.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Community Safety and Policing Act, Code of Conduct for Police Officers, O. Reg. 407/23:

Section 10(1) of the Community Safety Policing Act states “a police officer shall not conduct themselves in a manner that undermines, or is likely to undermine, public trust in policing.”

Section 19 of the Community Safety Policing Act states “police officer shall not, by act or omission, fail to perform their duties appropriately without lawful excuse if, at the time, they know or reasonably ought to know that their act or omission would amount to a failure to perform their

Decision and Reasons

The PS investigator reviewed the relevant Niche RMS report, Digital Evidence Management System evidence (including body-worn camera, written notice to tenants, interviews), officer duty reports and notes, Residential Tenancies Act, Criminal Code and the email from the Crown. The Respondent Officers complied with the law and police policy.