

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: 02/25/2026

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 Respondent Officer One conducted a negligent investigation with respect to the Complainant's report. The Complainant alleged that the investigative report authored by Respondent Officer One was not reflective of the allegations and that Respondent Officer One discouraged clarification and participation at the conclusion of the investigation. It was alleged that these actions were neglectful and undermined the public's trust in policing.

The Complainant alleged that Respondent Officer Two disregarded the Complainant's statement as evidence and contacted a witness outside of the formal investigative process. The Complainant alleged that Respondent Officer Two provided incorrect information. It was alleged that these actions undermined the public's trust in policing.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Respondent Officer One
Performance of Duties - S.19
Interactions with the Public - S. 10(1)

Respondent Officer Two
Interactions with the Public - S.10(1)

Decision and Reasons

The Investigation was reviewed and all necessary interviews were conducted.

Respondent Officer One's investigation was thorough and consistent with sexual assault investigative standards. There were not reasonable grounds to believe that Respondent Officer One, by act or omission, failed to perform their duties appropriately without lawful excuse if, at any time, they knew or reasonably ought to have known that their act or omission would have amounted to a failure to perform their duties. Respondent Officer One's investigative report was reflective of the allegations made by the Complainant and Respondent Officer One's conclusions were reasonable in the circumstances and on a balance of probabilities were in the good faith performance of their duties. Respondent Officer One provided supports consistent with sexual assault investigations and their post investigative conduct was reasonable in the circumstances and on a balance of probabilities was in the good faith performance of their duties.

Respondent Officer Two appropriately considered the Complainant's statement as evidence and all witness discussions completely by Respondent Officer Two were completed in Respondent Officer Two's official police capacity. There is no evidence to suggest that Respondent Officer Two provided incorrect information regarding sexual assault law in the Province of Ontario. Respondent Officer Two's actions and investigation were reasonable in the circumstances and on a balance of probabilities were in the good faith performance of their duties.