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: 01/22/2026

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 Respondent Officers who responded to her radio call for assistance were unprofessional during their interaction. The Complainant further alleged that the involved investigators failed to thoroughly investigate her alleged assault.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation #1
Interactions with the Public
s. 10(1) Undermine public trust

Allegation #2
Performance of Duties
s. 19 Neglect of duty

Decision and Reasons

The available evidence indicates that the Complainant's account lacked reliability and consistency, and the investigative findings did not support the allegations to the threshold of Reasonable Grounds. Her documented history of being aggressive with staff at the pharmacy, combined with her immediate anger and defensiveness when officers requested to photograph her injuries, raised early concerns about credibility. Her description of losing consciousness became increasingly inconsistent as she repeated it to investigators, and no injuries were observed during the initial on scene assessment despite the severe assault she described. Several elements of her narrative were unsupported or contradicted by objective evidence. Her explanation for videotaping the interaction did not align with the suspect's calm behaviour, and her claim that the pharmacist followed her outside to dissuade her from calling police was not reflected on the 911 recording. She further alleged that the pharmacist left an apologetic voicemail the next day, yet she deleted this message without reasonable justification. Pharmacy staff described her as verbally aggressive but did not witness any physical altercation, which further weakened the allegation.

Additional discrepancies emerged regarding her communication with Victim Services. Records confirmed that Victim Services contacted her on June 2nd, yet she later authorized an officer to make a referral on June 4th as though no contact had occurred. This contradiction, documented by both Victim Services and the investigative log, further undermined the accuracy of her recollection.

Ultimately, the points the Complainant believed to be evidentiary were determined to be assumptions or circumstantial, lacking the robustness required to support a criminal charge. The suspect was never identified, and the available information did not justify a production order to obtain identification. The investigation was conducted appropriately and thoroughly; the fact that it did not produce the outcome the Complainant desired does not render it neglectful.