

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: 11/18/2025

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 Respondent Officer #1 and Respondent Officer #2 failed to properly investigate a motor vehicle collision and provide necessary medical care following the incident.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Respondent Officer #1 and Respondent Officer #2:

Duty-Neglect or Omit - Sec 19 CPSA Reg. 407/29 be Unsubstantiated

Public-Fail to Care for Prisoner - Sec 9 CPSA Reg. 407/25 be Unsubstantiated

Public-Undermine Public Trust - Sec 10 CPSA Reg. 407/26 be Unsubstantiated

Decision and Reasons

Duty-Neglect or Omit - Sec 19 CPSA Reg. 407/29 be Unsubstantiated

The investigation has shown Respondent Officer #1 conducted a lawful impaired driving investigation consistent with training and established procedures. The transition from alcohol to a drug impairment investigation was appropriate based on observations and testing results.

The evidence has shown Respondent Officer #1 involvement was consistent with his assigned duties. There is no evidence that investigative steps were omitted or improperly conducted.

Based on reasonable grounds, the evidence does not support the allegation that Respondent Officer #1 or Respondent Officer #2 neglected or omitted to perform their duties without lawful excuse. The allegation of Duty Neglect / Omit levied against both officers is unsubstantiated.

Public-Fail to Care for Prisoner - Sec 9 CPSA Reg. 407/25 be Unsubstantiated

The evidence established the Complainant did not request medical assistance and did not present objectively observable indicators of any condition requiring medical intervention. She remained mobile, responsive, and was monitored while in custody. Officers provided care when she vomited. While a subsequent medical assessment revealed evidence of a diagnosis, it does not establish that her condition was readily apparent or identifiable at the time. Based on reasonable grounds, the evidence does not support the allegation Respondent Officer #1 or Respondent Officer #2 neglected the health or safety of the Complainant.

Public-Undermine Public Trust - Sec 10 CPSA Reg. 407/26 be Unsubstantiated

Independent witness evidence supports Respondent Officer #1 conducted herself professionally. There is no evidence of unprofessional conduct or behavior that would undermine public trust.

Additionally, such an assessment must remain grounded in the specific circumstances of each case. Not all contested interactions or unfavorable outcomes with police will amount to misconduct. Based on reasonable grounds, the evidence does not support the allegation that Respondent Officer #1 or Respondent Officer #2 conducted themselves unprofessionally, or in a manner that undermined public trust when they interacted with the Complainant. As such, the allegation of Public - Undermine Public Trust levied against both officers is unsubstantiated.