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:

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 Respondent Officers failed to conduct a fulsome investigation in response to allegations of unauthorized entry into the Complainant's residence by his landlord.

The Complainant further raised concerns regarding the initial call taking, including an alleged failure of an officer to properly identify themselves upon request, as well as issues related to communication and follow up.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Fail to Provide Identifying Information – Section 13(2)
Neglect to do a Duty – Section 19
Conduct Undermines Public Trust – Section 10

Decision and Reasons

Fail to Provide Identifying Information – Section 13(2)

An audio recorded telephone call substantiates the presence of significant audio interference, supporting RO1's explanation that the request for his identify was not received. This explanation is corroborated by RO1's subsequent, immediate, and voluntary disclosure of his badge number when prompted by another officer. Taken together, the objective evidence demonstrates a genuine communication barrier rather than deliberate non-compliance. As intent is a necessary component for a finding of misconduct in these circumstances, the threshold for misconduct is not met.

Neglect to do a Duty – Section 19

RO2 was required to assess and appropriately respond to the Complainant's concerns, which he did by documenting the complaint, attempting to caution the landlord, and directing the Complainant to the Landlord and Tenant Board, which is the proper forum for resolving disputes under the Residential Tenancies Act.

Conduct Undermines Public Trust – Section 10

RO1's decision not to dispatch a frontline response was a discretionary judgment made in good faith and supported by documented rationale. Although RO1 later provided misguided procedural advice by suggesting an FOI request instead of referring the Complainant to the investigating officer, this constituted a professional error rather than a marked departure from expected standards or an act motivated by bad faith, dishonesty, or an ulterior purpose.