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: 2025-11-27

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The complainant alleged that police threatened him with an arrest over a withdrawn warrant, causing significant stress and leading him to leave Canada. He claimed that officers acted unprofessionally, ignored his mental health condition, and continued to pressure him. He also alleged that officers failed to ensure he understood the situation, communicating only in English and not offering an interpreter.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Section 10 – conduct undermines public trust
Section 19 – neglects to do duty
Section 5 – discrimination – Human Rights Code

Decision and Reasons

Section 10 – conduct undermines public trust
The Investigator determined that communications with the complainant were made to ensure that he was aware of the legal situation and the existence of the warrant, and to provide him with the opportunity to surrender voluntarily. The officers conducted themselves professionally and acted within the scope of their duties. As a result, it was determined that there is insufficient evidence to establish that misconduct occurred, therefore, the allegation is unsubstantiated.

Section 19 – neglects to do duty
The Investigator determined that the complainant facilitated a breach while the non-association condition was still legally in effect. Accordingly, the officer within the scope of his duties when advising the complainant that a warrant had been issued for his arrest. As a result, it was determined that there is insufficient evidence to establish that misconduct occurred, therefore, the allegation is unsubstantiated.

Section 5 – discrimination – Human Rights Code
The Investigator determined that the complainant never indicated that he was mentally ill or required accommodations. He did not express confusion, request clarification, or ask for an interpreter. As a result, it was determined that there is insufficient evidence to establish that misconduct occurred, therefore, the allegation is unsubstantiated.