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: 02/14/2026

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 alleges the assigned case manager of an incident report refused to identify the complainants motor vehicle as stolen, the officer exhibited professional negligence by having a clear bias and failed to ensure the complainants personal safety. The complainant is alleging the case manager, identified as the respondent officer to have neglected his duties and in return diminished his trust.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019, S.O. 2019, c. 1, Schedule 1 Code of Conduct for Police Officer: Ontario Regulation 407/23.
This regulation sets out the code of conduct with which every police officer must comply.

Allegation #1

Performance of Duties

Section 19 Neglect of Duty

Decision and Reasons

Allegation #1

Performance of Duties

Section 19 Neglect of Duty

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 the Respondent Officer refused to investigate multiple incident reports as criminal and identify the complainants motor vehicles as stolen.

Respondent Officer 1 (RO1)

Finding: This investigation has revealed the officer was in the lawful performance of their duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities. The respondent officer was assigned an incident report and further investigated the report until no further evidence could be discovered. With no discovery of any criminal intent, the respondent officer concluded his investigation and notified all parties. Additionally, during the investigation, upon learning of some safety concerns involving the complainant, he initiated the appropriate investigator to assist the complainant.

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.