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: 12/13/2025

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 alleges the Respondent Officer failed to properly investigate an “organized financial fraud” despite being provided evidence to support an investigation.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation #1
Performance of Duties, in that he or she,

19. A 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 duties appropriately.

• It is alleged that the Respondent Officer failed to investigate the Complainant's report of fraud.

Decision and Reasons

Finding: This investigation determined that the Complainant did not report a fraud occurrence to the (Redacted) Service; therefore, the Respondent Officer was never assigned to investigate the matter. The Respondent Officer informed the Complainant of this and suggested a course of action to follow up with the appropriate police service. The Investigator confirmed that the Respondent Officer had no duty to investigate the Complainant's fraud allegation.

Based on the available information, the Investigator has concluded that there is insufficient evidence to establish reasonable grounds that misconduct has occurred.

Therefore, the allegation is unsubstantiated.