

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:

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 arises from an incident on January 13, 2026, in which the Complainant was stopped by police after his vehicle was identified as stolen.

The Complainant reported that he had previously reported his vehicle stolen in December 2025 but had subsequently located it, advised police, and was stopped on December 20th, 2025. Despite this, the vehicle remained listed as stolen. On January 13th, 2026, he was stopped, removed from his vehicle, arrested at gunpoint, handcuffed, and detained. He alleges that the force used was excessive and that the arrest was unlawful.

The Complainant further alleged that officers ignored his attempts to explain the situation and treated both him and his passenger in a disrespectful manner.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Performance of Duties, by act or omission, fail to preform your duties appropriately without lawful excuse, that you knew or reasonable ought to have known would among to fail to preform your duties appropriately, contrary to section 19 of Ontario Regulation 407/23 of the Community Safety Policing Act

Use of Force, you used force on a member of the public, contrary to section 11 of Ontario Regulation 407/23 of the Community Safety Policing Act

Decision and Reasons

Allegation #1 Performance of Duties:

The evidence does not support that the Respondent Officers neglected their duties.

At the time of the incident, the involved officers relied on an ALPR hit that was corroborated by CPIC, which confirmed that the vehicle was listed as stolen. CPIC is the authoritative national database and is reasonably relied upon by officers in the lawful execution of their duties. The ensuing police response, including the decision to conduct a high-risk vehicle stop, consistent with training and established operational practices when dealing with a confirmed stolen vehicle.

While Procedure 15-21 requires verification across available databases where practicable, the evidence demonstrates that real-time cross-referencing of additional systems (such as VDX) was not feasible given the dynamic nature of the incident, the limitations of in-car systems, and the fact that RO#1 was actively engaged in following the vehicle while coordinating resources.

Respondent Officers #2 and #3 were acting under the direction of a supervisor and were not responsible for conducting database queries.

The investigation determined that the underlying cause of the incident was a systemic and administrative failure, specifically the failure to properly update CPIC following the recovery of the vehicle and the presence of duplicate and conflicting database entries. These issues were beyond the control of the Respondent Officers.

There is no evidence of willful neglect, or a level of carelessness rising to misconduct. Rather, the officers acted reasonably, diligently, and in good faith based on the information available to them at the time.

Allegation #2 Use of Force:

The evidence does not support that the force used by the Respondent Officers was excessive.

The use of force must be assessed based on the circumstances as they reasonably appeared to