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: 02/24/2026

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 first Respondent Officer failed to properly investigate a dispute between him and a neighbour. He alleged that the officer failed to lay charges against the neighbour, failed to interview relevant witnesses, failed to obtain a statement from him, failed to promptly advise him of the reasons for his arrest, and failed to provide him with medical care.

The Complainant further alleged that the first Respondent Officer had a personal relationship with the neighbour, which influenced the decision not to lay charges.

The Complainant also alleged that a second Respondent Officer later advised him that the investigation was closed and that no charges would be laid against the neighbour.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Public-Undermine Public Trust - Sec 10 CSPA Reg. 407/23 x2
Integrity-Use Position - Sec 16 CSPA Reg. 407/23 x2
Duty-Neglect or Omit - Sec 19 CSPA Reg. 407/23 x2

Decision and Reasons

Undermine Public Trust – Section 10

The Professional Standards Investigator reviewed the available evidence and determined that the first Respondent Officer's actions were based on his assessment of the circumstances, the available evidence, and the applicable legal thresholds. The investigation further determined that the second Respondent Officer's involvement occurred after the original investigation had concluded and was limited to reviewing the matter and advising the Complainant that the investigation was closed, no charges would be laid. Although the Complainant disagreed with the investigative outcome and the later decision not to revisit the matter, the evidence did not establish that either Respondent Officer acted in bad faith, disregarded relevant evidence, or conducted himself in a manner likely to undermine public trust in policing. As a result, the allegation of Undermine Public Trust is not substantiated.

Integrity / Use Position – Section 16

The Complainant alleged that the first Respondent Officer had a personal relationship with the neighbour, which influenced the decision not to lay charges. The Professional Standards Investigator reviewed the allegation of bias, conflict of interest, or inappropriate familiarity. The investigation did not identify evidence that either Respondent Officer used his position to benefit another person, acted for an improper purpose, or influenced the investigative decision. The investigation also did not identify evidence that the first Respondent Officer had a personal relationship with the neighbour. As a result, the allegation of Integrity / Use Position is not substantiated.

Duty / Neglect or Omit – Section 19

The Complainant alleged that the first Respondent Officer failed to properly investigate the incident, failed to lay charges against the neighbour, failed to interview relevant witnesses, failed