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: 01/21/2026

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 (Compl) submitted a complaint that alleged that the Respondent Officer (RO1) neglected his duty by failing to review all available evidence and failing to conduct a full investigation. As a result, the Compl was charged with assault and the charges were withdrawn by the Crown.

Upon review of the complaint, the PS investigator requested that the investigating officer for the incident be added as a Respondent Officer (RO2).

RO1 and RO2 investigated an intimate partner violence (IPV) incident on March 12, 2025. The Compl had reported being assaulted by his current partner's ex-spouse. RO1 and RO2 attended the scene. Medical aid was offered to the Compl. After speaking to all three involved parties and reviewing video footage and screenshot evidence, RO1 and RO2 formed reasonable grounds to believe that the Compl had assaulted his current partner's ex-spouse. RO1 advised the Compl he was under arrest. The Compl was read his right to counsel and caution. He was asked to provide a statement and he declined.

The Crown ultimately withdrew the charge against the Compl due to "Non cooperation of the complainant and health issues of the accused." Notwithstanding this disposition, the withdrawal of the charge did not diminish the appropriateness of the initial decision to lay the charge, which was based on the reasonable grounds that existed at the time.

PSU investigated the incident and concluded that the allegations of neglect to do duty were unsubstantiated.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Community Safety and Policing Act, Code of Conduct for Police Officers, O. Reg. 407/23:

Section 19 of the Community Safety Policing Act states “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.”

Decision and Reasons

The PS investigator reviewed the relevant Niche RMS report, Digital Evidence Management System evidence (including body-worn camera, video evidence, screenshots, interviews), officer duty reports and notes, Ontario Public-Police Interactions Training Aid (2023), Ontario Provincial Police Orders (IPV occurence), Criminal Code and the email from the Crown. The Respondent Officers complied with the law and police policy.