

**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: 02/17/2026

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 in this matter alleged that the Respondent Officers did not conduct a proper investigation and discriminated against his disability by not allowing him to use text to talk to communicate with them.

**Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations****Section 19- Neglect of Duty****Section 5(1) – Treat Person in Contravention of the Human Rights Code****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 Officers did not conduct a proper investigation into his partners harassment.

Respondent Officer 1 (RO1)

Respondent Officer 2 (RO2)

Finding: This investigation has revealed the officers were in the lawful performance of their duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities. The Respondent Officers investigated the Comlao9nnts concerns and gave him some advice. It had come to light that the Complainant had already previously reported the same issue to RO2 on a previous date. The Complainant disclosed that his mental being was affected and the Respondent Officers suggested that he attends CAMH to see a doctor. The Complainant agreed and went with the Officers. The Respondent Officers took his complaint seriously and conducted a through investigation.

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.