

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: 03/05/2026

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 fail to perform duties by RO1 and that he was setup by police.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Section 10, 19

Decision and Reasons

There is no evidence to substantiate the complaint. 2 Crown attorneys had no issues with the conduct of RO1. There is no evidence the complainant was setup at all. Even the video shows the complainant slapping the third party in the head. The reason for charging could not have been clearer. The complainant is upset he had to pay \$25K in lawyer fees and embarrassed he dragged his son into this incident and got him charged too.