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: 05/04/2026

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 had an package delivered to the wrong address.

The Complainant put in a theft report. It is alleged that RO1 failed to investigate the matter properly and told her it was not a police matter.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Neglect of Duty Section - Section 19
Undermine Public Trust - Section 10(1)

Decision and Reasons

(1) Neglect of Duty

The Complainant submitted a theft report regarding her Amazon package that was delivered to the wrong address. The Complainant received one item back from the delivery.

The Investigator reviewed the report, and all of the actions that RO1 took. There was no surveillance video to show who took the package.

The Investigator concluded that RO1acted promptly, maintained appropriate communication with the Complainant, pursued all reasonable investigative avenues, and properly concluded that no further steps were available when the evidence did not support reasonable grounds for a criminal charge.

(2) Undermine Public Trust

The Complainant alleges that RO1 stopped responding to her emails, closed the case and told her that it was not a police matter.

The Investigator reviewed the email communication between the Complainant and RO1.

The Investigator concluded the documented email correspondence shows that RO1 remained responsive, provided explanations regarding the investigative outcome, and did not advise the Complainant that the matter was “not a police issue,” but rather that no further investigative steps were available based on the evidence. There is no evidence to support the claim that RO1 ceased communication or improperly closed the matter.