

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: [REDACTED]



Date of Complaint: 01/23/2026

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service: ☒

Referred to Other Service: ☐

Retained by LECA: ☐

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

This complaint arose from an incident in the City of [REDACTED] in which [REDACTED] Police Service [REDACTED] respondent officers attended an Intimate Partner Violence incident. The complainant alleged that they were wrongfully arrested and falsely charged with Assault against CW#1 and CW#2. The complainant further alleged that, during the arrest, the respondent officers employed improper restraint techniques that resulted in serious physical injury and were dismissive and accusatory throughout their interactions with the complainant.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation #1 - Performance of Duties (Neglects to do Duty) - Sec. 19

Allegation #2 - Interactions with the Public (Conduct Undermines Public Trust) -Sec. 10

Decision and Reasons

Allegation #1:

A 911 call was placed by CW1 and the respondent officers responded. Through investigation, evidence that supported the charges of assault cause bodily harm - strangulation of CW1 and assault on CW2 was obtained. The complainant was arrested and transported to cell block. Upon arrival to cell block, the complainant requested medical attention and was subsequently taken to local hospital for assessment where he was later released. The releasing doctor determined that no serious injury had occurred.

The Intimate Partner Violence incident was investigated by an accredited Intimate Partner Violence investigator who supported the mandatory criminal charges laid against the complainant. The complainant was held in custody for a show cause hearing as per criminal code provisions.

The respondent officers were found to have done an fulsome investigation, gathered evidence to support reasonable grounds to believe an offence had been committed, and followed police procedures and related legislation when conducting their investigation. The allegation of Neglect to do Duty was unsubstantiated.

Allegation #2:

Officers were equipped with Body-Worn Cameras (BWC). A review of the BWC footage provided objective evidence of the interaction. The footage demonstrated that the complainant was treated fairly and respectfully throughout the encounter. Based on the available evidence, the allegation of Conduct that Undermines Public Trust was unsubstantiated.

CONCLUSION: The Chief did not have reasonable grounds to believe that the actions of the officers constituted misconduct.