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: 02/12/2026

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 the Respondent Officer(RO) pressured him to perform a medical procedure, interfered with the physician-patient relationship, and was intimidating and unprofessional.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Public- Undermine Public Trust - Sec 10 CSPA Reg. 407/23

Decision and Reasons

The Complainant indicated that the Respondent Officer pressured him to obtain a blood sample from a patient, interfered with the physician-patient relationship by preventing a private examination, and acted in an intimidating and unprofessional manner which included implying potential legal consequences from delay of obtaining the blood sample.

The Investigator concluded the Respondent Officer had made a lawful demand of a person in police custody to provide a sample of their blood. As per the Criminal Code and police policy the sample of blood was to be obtained at a hospital by a physician or their designate. Initially the physician believed they could not obtain a blood sample without a warrant and the Respondent Officer attempted to explain their authority to do so without a warrant. The physician consulted with other hospital staff and hospital policy and learned the sample could be obtained without a warrant however they required the patients consent.

The physician attempted to prevent the Respondent Officer from observing their examination of the patient. It was reasonable that the Respondent Officer be able to continuously observe the patient as they were in police custody and the purpose of the examination was only to determine the patients ability to consent. During the examination, the Respondent Officer overheard the physician provide legal advice to the patient which was a marked departure from their role, caused confusion for the patient, and delayed the process of obtaining a blood sample. As a result, the Respondent Officer requested the physician provide their contact information in the event he is required to testify as a witness in court proceedings and explain the reason for the delay.

The totality of the evidence demonstrated that the conflict between the Respondent Officer and the physician arose as a result of a misunderstanding of legal authority and professional roles. There was no evidence to support that the Respondent Officer was intimidating and unprofessional.