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: 03/10/2026

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 alleged that the initial report of a break and enter at his residence was not properly investigated. He further asserted that the subsequent investigation involved both bias and negligence by several members of the (Redacted) Additionally, he alleged that negligence in the follow-up investigation resulted in the withdrawal of charges against the identified offender.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Duty-Neglect or Omit - Sec 19 CSPA Reg. 407/23
Public-Undermine Public Trust - Sec 10 CSPA Reg. 407/23

Decision and Reasons

Neglect of Duty

Allegation: It was alleged Officer 1 deliberately neglected her duty by ignoring evidence of a break and enter during the May 21, 2024 call for service, despite information provided by a witness.
Reasoning
Officer 1 assessed the information available at the time, which did not identify any specific stolen property or provide evidence that a break and enter had occurred. She later confirmed with a witness that the attending individual had lawful authority to enter for the purpose of retrieving personal belongings. Her decision not to initiate a break and enter investigation was based on the available facts and supported by supervisory review. There is insufficient evidence she ignored clear indicators of an offence or failed to conduct a proper investigation. The allegation of Neglect of Duty is unsubstantiated.

It was alleged Officer 2 failed to properly assess evidence—specifically a photograph and an audio recording—that the complainant stated would have supported charges against a witness.
Reasoning – Officer 2 reviewed the occurrences, determined further follow-up was required, and assigned the matter to Officer 3. He reviewed the photograph and, after consultation, concluded it lacked evidentiary value. There is no evidence an audio recording was ever received, and the complainant did not use alternate methods available for submitting it. Officer 2 assessed the material available to him and acted appropriately. The allegation of Neglect of Duty is unsubstantiated.

It was alleged Officer 3 conducted a negligent investigation, failed to interview relevant witnesses, ignored photographic and audio evidence, declined to collect forensic evidence, and intentionally limited investigative steps to have the charge dismissed.
Reasoning – Officer 3 conducted multiple interviews, reviewed available physical evidence, and formed reasonable and probable grounds to charge the suspect with break and enter. The Crown later elected to withdraw the charge for reasons including diversion, which can only occur where a reasonable prospect of conviction remains. This indicates the evidence submitted was sufficient