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: 12/01/2025

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 that the Respondent Officer, engaged in improper enforcement by focusing attention on him in a trespassing matter, while taking no action against another individual who entered the property.

The Complainant further alleged that the Respondent Officer remained involved in the matter despite an existing complaint.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

- Duty – Neglect or Omit – S. 19 CSPA Reg. 407/29
- Conduct Undermines Public Trust – S. 10(1) CSPA Reg. 407/29

Decision and Reasons

Neglect of Duty

The allegation of neglect of duty was unsubstantiated. Evidence from occurrence reports, duty notes, and RMS entries confirmed that the officer's involvement was limited to attending for officer safety purposes. The officer did not interact with any parties and did not participate in the investigation or decision-making process.

Corroborative evidence from the investigating officer established that all investigative steps and enforcement decisions were made independently, based on the available evidence, and resulted in a caution only. There was no evidence the officer failed to perform any required duty.Conduct

Undermining Public Trust

The allegation of conduct undermining public trust was unsubstantiated. Documentary evidence, including occurrence records and witness officer evidence, confirmed the officer's role was limited and non-investigative. The officer did not influence the investigation or enforcement outcome, and there was no evidence of intimidation, differential treatment, or inconsistent enforcement.
FOI-related records confirmed the officer's name appeared only in administrative documentation and that they had no role in the disclosure process.

The evidence did not support a pattern of misconduct or behaviour likely to undermine public trust.

Based on the available evidence, including reports, officer evidence, and documentation, there were no reasonable grounds to establish misconduct. Both allegations were unsubstantiated.