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: 01/15/2026

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 has alleged that on or between 2025.10.21 and 2025.11.26 the Respondent Officers were neglectful and unprofessional in their role regarding the investigation into her allegations against her neighbour causing damage to her roof, as she believes that criminal charges should have been laid.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation #1 - Integrity - s. 19 Neglect of duty

Allegation #2 - Interactions with the Public - s. 10(1) Undermine public trust

Decision and Reasons

The totality of the evidence shows that, while the Complainant believed her neighbour damaged her roof in retaliation for being reported to the City of [redacted], there was no proof to support this assumption. The only witness she identified could confirm the damage but not how it occurred, and four experienced investigators, along with a Crown Attorney, independently determined that the available information did not meet the threshold for a criminal charge. Throughout the process, officers consistently communicated with the Complainant, explained the rationale for their decisions, and escalated the matter at her request, ultimately concluding the investigation in just over a month. Although the Complainant disagreed with the outcome and expressed frustration that RO2 consulted the Crown without speaking to her directly, all relevant information had already been provided through RO1, making further interviews unnecessary. The Crown's agreement with the officers' assessment further reinforced that the decision was appropriate and made in good faith. There is no evidence to suggest any officer acted unprofessionally; disagreement with the outcome does not equate to misconduct, and the officers' actions were reasonable, thorough, and aligned with their duties.