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: 12/30/2025

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 (CM) alleged aggressive arrest tactics, unnecessary force, failure to provide rights to counsel, and disrespectful conduct by responding officers.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

CSPA O. Reg. 407/23 sec. 10
CSPA O. Reg. 407/23 sec. 11

Decision and Reasons

Based on the evidence reviewed, the allegations made by the Complainant (CM) are not substantiated. The evidence supports that the Respondent Officers (RO's) had reasonable grounds to arrest the CM and were authorized under the Criminal Code to use force as necessary to effect the arrest. The evidence further demonstrates that the CM was properly advised of their right to counsel. Additionally, the conduct of the RO's throughout their interactions with the CM was found to be professional, respectful, and undertaken in good faith. Accordingly, the evidence does not support a finding of misconduct or any breach of the CM's rights by the Respondent Officers.