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: 02/25/2026

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service: ◉ Referred to Other Service: ○ Retained by LECA: ○

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

On February 9, 2026, the Complainant filed a complaint with the LECA. The complaint was referred for investigation on February 25, 2026, and assigned to the investigator on March 5, 2026.

The Complainant alleged that during an interaction with the Respondent Officer, he was rude, unprofessional, and condescending, further alleging that the Respondent Officer undermined public trust.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation 1
10. (1) A police officer shall not conduct themselves in a manner that undermines, or is likely to undermine, public trust in policing.

It is alleged that the respondent officers undermined public trust by confronting the complainant in a rude, aggressive and unprofessional manner, and without lawful authority, demanded she identify herself.

Decision and Reasons

There is no evidence to support the fact that respondent officer intimated the complainant. The complainant may have felt intimidated by the respondent officer asking her name and their supervisor's name. The respondent officer was well within his rights to ask those questions if he felt the complainant was rude and unprofessional. The complainant's supervisor would determine if the allegations were true or not. Addressing the allegation that the respondent officer acted rudely, aggressive, and unprofessional manner. There are statements from two civilian witnesses and one officer. Both the complainant and respondent officer provided statements that they themselves were always professional and that the other was rude and unprofessional.

None of the witnesses heard any of the conversation between the complainant and the respondent officer, nor did they observe any behaviour that could of been perceived as aggressive or inappropriate. There was surveillance video in the lobby that captured the interaction. The surveillance video did not have audio, the video did not provide any evidence of the complainant's allegations. The respondent officer's body language was calm and relaxed.