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:

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 called Police to assist her in dealing with someone who was being violent.
Respondent officers, RO1 and RO2, attended.
The ROs were not sensitive to the issues present and not equipped to deal with these types of issues.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Section 10 - Conduct undermines public trust

Decision and Reasons

RO1 resigned from the OPS before the complainant filed a report with LECA and is no longer a police officer. Consequently, RO1 is not a subject to CSPA legislation.

RO2 had minimal interaction with the complainant and her son.

There is no evidence to support complainant's allegations. The audio recording submitted by the complainant made surreptitiously by the complainant of RO1 and RO2 does not support complainant's interpretation of the interaction.

Allegations were unsubstantiated.