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: 03/03/2026

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 alleges that the respondent officer contacted him and unlawfully trespassed them from a property he co-owns and manages. Further the complainant indicates that the respondent officer threatened him and directed him to fix rental unit issues that the complainant feels falls more under the Landlord Tenant Tribunal legislation.

The complainant also detailed complaints of ongoing police inaction regarding his daughter who frequently goes missing, uses drugs and alcohol and is underage. The daughter does these things without adult permission, and the family is involved with the Children's Aid Society. The complainant alleges that the respondent officer is not assisting in any meaningful way.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation 1 – Section 10 – Conduct Undermines Public Trust

That the Respondent Officer, on or about August 02nd, 2025, at or near (Redacted) did engage in conduct that undermined, or was likely to undermine, public trust and confidence in the integrity of the Association and/or the law enforcement profession, contrary to Section 10 of the LECA Code of Conduct.

Allegation 2 – Section 19 – Neglects to do Duty

Decision and Reasons

Allegation 1 – Section 10 – Conduct Undermines Public Trust
That the Respondent Officer, on or about August 02nd, 2025, at or near (Redacted), did engage in conduct that undermined, or was likely to undermine, public trust and confidence in the integrity of the Association and/or the law enforcement profession, contrary to Section 10 of the LECA Code of Conduct.

In response to Allegation 1 this investigation was unable to reveal any tangible evidence that the Respondent Officer did in fact place a trespass order on the complainant in relation to the property that he manages. What is clear is that the Respondent Officer was lawfully engaged in an investigation regarding the tenant and the complainant. Information was produced by the tenant showing repeated and uncomfortable text messages and phone calls that were unwanted. At the request of the tenant the respondent Officer rightfully instructed the complainant to cease and desist any type of communication with the tenant moving forward as it was making her uncomfortable and stressed out. These instructions to the complainant were well documented, clear and based on the alleged harassment being detailed by the tenant. Neither the complainant, the Respondent Officer nor the tenant were able to produce any type of material with evidentiary value to indicate that a trespass order was levied against the complainant. For those reasons Allegation #1 as detailed above is unsubstantiated.

Allegation 2 – Section 19 – Neglects to do Duty
That the Respondent Officer, on or about August 02nd, 2025, at or near (Redacted), did neglect to perform a duty imposed by law, policy, procedure, lawful order, or the responsibilities of their position by failing to [describe the duty], contrary to Section 19 of the LECA Code of Conduct.

This allegation arises from a complex and ongoing family situation involving the complainant and his daughter. Over an extended period, the (Redacted) Police Service responded to numerous incidents after the complainant's daughter repeatedly left the family home and sought refuge with a friend and the friend's family due to concerns she expressed regarding her safety and well-being at home.