

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: 06/03/2026

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 reported disclosing allegations of sexual assault and a prolonged history of intimate partner violence to a police officer in November 2025. The complainant stated the initial officer was supportive and that the matter was later referred for further investigation. In early 2026, the complainant participated in a recorded interview with an investigator from another police service and repeated the allegations of abuse.

After several months without an update, the complainant contacted an assigned investigator and received a response the complainant perceived as rude, dismissive, judgmental, and passive aggressive. The complainant also took issue with comments concerning a related family law matter, which the complainant considered unnecessary and upsetting.

The complainant raised concerns with another investigator and was advised there was insufficient evidence to proceed with a criminal charge, including issues relating to consent. The complainant disagreed with that assessment and believed investigators should have sought further information before concluding there was not enough evidence.

The complainant alleged that investigators failed to properly consider or follow up on the broader history of abuse described during the investigation. The complainant felt the matter was handled with limited empathy and sensitivity, particularly given the nature of the reported sexual assault and intimate partner violence.

Overall, the complainant alleged that the officers involved were dismissive and judgmental, failed to adequately investigate or respond to the reported concerns, and left the complainant feeling unsupported after reporting serious allegations involving intimate partner violence, sexual assault, and related child-safety concerns.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation 1 – Undermines Public Trust -CSPA O.Reg 407/23 sec. 10

A police officer shall not conduct themselves in a manner that undermines, or is likely to undermine, public trust in policing.

Allegation 2 – Fail to Perform Duties -CSPA O.Reg 407/23 sec. 19

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.

Decision and Reasons

Based on the available material, there is insufficient evidence to establish that the involved officers failed to perform their duties. The investigation included reasonable steps, including arranging and reviewing a complainant interview, considering related police history and child-welfare or family-law context, reviewing relevant communications, and documenting the rationale for not proceeding with criminal charges. A supervisory review also found there were no reasonable grounds to lay charges.

The professional standards unit also attempted to resolve the matter through an early resolution process. The complainant initially agreed to participate in a further interview with another investigator, was advised that the original investigative outcome might not change, and was given an opportunity to provide additional information. The complainant later cancelled the interview and did not reschedule.

Although some communication could have been more neutral and trauma-informed, particularly in relation to allegations involving sexual assault and intimate partner violence, the evidence does not establish misconduct or a failure to investigate. The supervisory response may not have satisfied the complainant, but the available information indicates the matter was reviewed and an investigative assessment was provided. The allegations are unsubstantiated.