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: 11/25/2025

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 alleged conduct undermines pubic trust, conceal identifying information, neglect of duty improper use of position and deceive or mislead and mishandling of an assault investigation. The investigation stemming from an incident involving himself and a store owner. He reported providing extensive and actionable information, including personal video recordings. The complainant alleged that the officers were neglectful and biased in their decisions.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

10 conduct undermines public trust
13(1) conceal identifying information
16(1) improper use of position
19 neglects to do duty
31 deceive or mislead

Decision and Reasons

The review examined whether the investigation into a reported assault was adequate, fair, reasonable, and whether the decision to conclude the matter as non criminal was supported by the evidentiary record.

The assessment found that assigned officers gathered available statements, reviewed available materials, examined video evidence by both parties, and assessed information provided by the complainant. Although a disturbance did occure, no criminality was found.

The decision to classify the matter as non criminal was supported by the record, and the investigation was found to be reasonable, proportionate, and consistent with policing standards.

Insufficient evidence to support any misconduct.