

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

The Complainant submitted a written complaint to the Law Enforcement Complaints Agency (LECA) regarding his interaction with numerous members of the Police Service.

In his complaint the Complainant indicated that after he provided information regarding a potential threat against an active member of the Police Service, he was forced/coerced to give an audio statement to officers.

After speaking with police an arrest warrant was issued for the Complainant's arrest,

The Complainant was subsequently arrested

The Complainant indicated that during his transport one officer turned off their body-worn camera.

Upon arrival the Complainant indicated that he was forced to give a lengthy audio/video statement and that the officer in charge of his case acted in an aggressive and unprofessional manner.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation #1 - Interactions with the public, Section 10(1)
 Allegation #2 - Human Rights and the Charter, Section 6(1)
 Allegation #3 - Performance of duties, Section 27

Decision and Reasons

Allegation #1

Finding: After reviewing all of the available information it is clear that the Respondent Officers treated the Complainant in a professional manner and ensured that he was provided with basic necessities including dietary restricted food and water throughout each interaction. Therefore, the investigating officer has determined that there is an insufficient body of evidence to establish reasonable grounds to believe misconduct has occurred. The allegation is unsubstantiated.

Respondent Officer 1 (RO1)
 Respondent Officer 2 (RO2)
 Respondent Officer 3 (RO3)
 Respondent Officer 4 (RO4)
 Respondent Officer 5 (RO5)

Allegation #2

Finding: After reviewing all of the available evidence it is clear that during both interviews of the Complainant Respondent Officer's 1, 2 and 3 complied with a legislative guidelines and authorities and ensured that the Complainant's charter rights were not infringed upon in any manner. The Complainant was clearly an active participant in both interviews and at no point refused to cooperate. The Complainant was given reasonable access to a telephone and received proper legal guidance from Duty Counsel as well as his own preferred legal counsel. Therefore, the investigating officer has determined that there is an insufficient body of evidence to establish reasonable grounds to believe misconduct has occurred. The allegation is unsubstantiated.

Respondent Officer 1 (RO1)
 Respondent Officer 2 (RO2)
 Respondent Officer 3 (RO3)