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: 04/09/2026

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 alleges police misconduct during investigations of family/domestic matters involving the Complainant and the Complainant's parents. The Complainant refers to one primary incident when officers attended a call for service at the Complainant's residence regarding a family/domestic dispute.

In reference to the primary incident, the Complainant alleges:

-officers opened the Complainant's door and entered without consent (unlawful entry)
-officers refused to provide their names and badge numbers
-officers illegally detained the Complainant during the investigation
-officers failed to properly investigate the incident
-officers failed to follow Service procedures while investigating the incident
-officers inaccurately reported the occurrence

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

1 – Conduct that undermines public trust in policing O. Reg. 407/23 S.10
2 – Fail to provide identification O. Reg. 407/23 S.13(2)
3 – Unauthorized physical or psychological detention O. Reg. 407/23 S.8(1)
4 – Neglect of Duty O. Reg. 407/23 S.19
5 – Fail to comply with Service Governance 407/23 S.27
6 – Deceit 407/23 S.31

Decision and Reasons

Allegation 1 - This investigation revealed that the responding officers did in fact partially open the Complainant's front door. This was done in an effort to make contact with someone at a priority 911 call. The minimal level of intrusiveness was reasonable in the circumstances, and the officers actions were lawful and in the good faith performance of their duties.
This allegation is unsubstantiated.

Allegation 2 - This investigation revealed no evidence that the RO's were ever asked for their name or badge numbers, or identification of any kind. The interaction was captured on BWC, and at no point did the Complainant make any such request. The officers were in full uniform displaying their names and badge numbers.
This allegation is unsubstantiated.

Allegation 3 - This investigation revealed the officers were called to attend the Complainant's residence, and duty bound to investigate and resolve the issues. The officers separated the parties upon arrival to safely ascertain what occurred. No unlawful or unauthorized detention occurred.
This allegation is unsubstantiated.

Allegation 4 - The officers attended a 911 call and investigated it, and took action based on the information provided to them. The investigation was captured entirely on BWC. No evidence was presented they neglected their duties.
This allegation is unsubstantiated.

Allegation 5 - The officers followed service procedure during their investigation of the Complainant's incident. No information was presented otherwise.
This allegation is unsubstantiated.

Allegation 6 - The responding officers documented the incident in an occurrence report. While more detail could have been included, nothing in (or omitted from) the report could be