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: 03/12/2026

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 states that he was the victim of an assault that he reported to the [Police Service] for Investigation. The Complainant raises concerns about the way the Respondent Officer and Witness Officers presented information and updates, and how they investigated the matter.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation #1
Interactions with the Public,
Section 10(1) A police officer shall not conduct themselves in a manner that undermines, or is likely to undermine, public trust in policing.
• It is alleged that the Respondent Officer investigated an assault allegation in a manner that was biased and incomplete failing to update the Complainant throughout.
Respondent Officer 1 (RO1)

Allegation #2

Decision and Reasons

Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019, S.O. 2019, c. 1, Schedule 1 Code of Conduct for Police Officer: Ontario Regulation 407/23.

This regulation sets out the code of conduct with which every police officer must comply

Allegation #1
Interactions with the Public,
Section 10(1), A police officer shall not conduct themselves in a manner that undermines, or is likely to undermine, public trust in policing.
• It is alleged that the Respondent Officer investigated an assault allegation in a manner that was biased and incomplete failing to update the Complainant throughout.
Respondent Officer 1 (RO1)

Finding: This investigation revealed that the Respondent Officer acted in accordance with all governing authorities. Based on a review and analysis of the information, the investigation has determined that there is insufficient evidence to establish that misconduct occurred. Therefore, the allegation is unsubstantiated.

Allegation #2
Duties and Responsibilities,
Section 19, A police officer shall not by act or omission, fail to perform their duties appropriately without lawful excuse, that they knew, or reasonably ought to have known would amount to failure to perform their duties.
• It is alleged that the Respondent Officer failed to conduct a thorough impartial investigation.
Respondent Officer 1 (RO1)

Finding: This investigation revealed that the Respondent Officer was in the lawful performance of his duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities. The Respondent Officer conducted a thorough investigation. Ultimately, the investigation led to Criminal Charges that