

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: 03/15/2026

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service: ☐

Referred to Other Service: ☒

Retained by LECA: ☐

Service Investigations Referred to: Peel Regional

De-identified Summary of Complaint

The complainant alleged the Respondent Officer neglected his duty when he refused to take his statement and was not professional during a telephone call.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Duty Neglect or Omit – Sec 19 Ontario Regulation 407/23 be Unsubstantiated
Public-Uncivil - Sec 12(1) Ontario Regulation 407/23 be Unsubstantiated

Decision and Reasons

Duty Neglect or Omit – Sec 19 Ontario Regulation 407/23 be Unsubstantiated:

The investigation has shown The Respondent Officer continued his investigation, and on May 2, 2025, he reviewed BWC, ICC and Police garage camera footage. The evidence did not corroborate claims made by the complainant in his LECA complaint. Additionally, the evidence confirmed the complainant's sequence of events contradicted his narrative. The Respondent Officer submitted a request for termination with LECA who requested an investigative report. The complainant's allegations were unsubstantiated, and The Respondent Officers findings were upheld by LECA.

The investigation has shown, The Respondent Officer's actions were aligned with [REDACTED] Police Directive D – Code of Ethics, which states, "I will preserve the dignity of all persons and subordinate my own self-interests for the common good...I will honour the obligations of my office and strive to attain excellence in the performance of my duties."

Based on reasonable grounds, the evidence does not support the allegation that The Respondent Officer neglected or omitted to perform his duties without lawful excuse. The allegation of Duty Neglect / Omit levied against The Respondent Officer is unsubstantiated.

Public-Uncivil - Sec 12(1) Ontario Regulation 407/23 be Unsubstantiated:

The Respondent Officer refuted the allegations made in the complainant's LECA complaint. He was professional, courteous and respectful during all verbal and email exchanges with the complainant. The officer denied the allegations and there is no independent evidence available to corroborate the complainant's assertion. Further, he advised the complainant was erratic, rude, unpredictable, yelled, and swore at him. The Respondent Officer's actions were aligned with [REDACTED] Police Directive E – Code of Conduct 5(k), which states, "be courteous with all persons encountered".

The complainant alleged witnesses overheard The Respondent Officer's taunts, and the PSU Investigator impressed on the complainant the importance of providing witness information as