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: 01/19/2026

Type of Investigation:

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

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint
he Complainant contacted Police regarding a theft. The Complainant believed the Respondent Officers neglected to do their duties and conduct a proper investigation.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Section 19- Negelct of Duty

Decision and Reasons

Allegation #1

Performance of Duties
Section 19- Neglect of Duty
A police officer shall not, by act or omission, fail to perform their duties appropriately without lawful excuse if, at the time, they know or reasonably ought to know that their act or omission would amount to a failure to perform their duties appropriately.

• It is alleged that the Respondent Officer's did not conduct a proper investigation.

Respondent Officer 1 (RO1)
Respondent Officer 2 (RO2)

Finding: This investigation has revealed the officer(s) were in the lawful performance of their duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities. The first incident that RO1 attended was did not fall under the threshold of a break and enter. RO1 did his due diligence and beyond that to assist the Complainant. RO2 made attempts to meet the Complainant, and the Complainant was not co-operating with providing his exact location.

RO1 and RO2 were not neglecting their duties and they both provided service to the Complainant, as necessary.

Based on the available information, the Investigator has concluded that there is insufficient evidence to establish reasonable grounds that misconduct has occurred.

Therefore, the allegation is unsubstantiated.