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: 02/14/2026

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service: ◉ Referred to Other Service: ○ Retained by LECA: ○

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

On October 5, 2025, an individual, contacted the [Police Service] to report historical incidents involving the complainant. .

On October 8, 2025, the Respondent Officer (RO) attended to investigate this matter. During the course of this investigation the RO formed reasonable grounds to arrest and charge the complainant for a criminal offence. The complainant could not be immediately located and the RO applied for a warrant for their arrest.

The complainant alleges that the RO did not conduct a thorough investigation and missed several investigative steps before making the decision to apply for a warrant for their arrest.

The complainant further alleged that the RO mislead the justice of the peace when they applied for a warrant for their arrest by stating that his whereabouts are unknown.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

CSPA O/Reg 407/23
Section 19 - Performance of Duties - Neglect of Duty
Section 31 - Performance of Duties - Police officer shall not deceive or mislead any person in relation to the officer's duties

Decision and Reasons

Section 19 - Performance of Duties - Neglect of Duty
Unsubstantiated

The complainant alleges that the RO failed to perform their duties appropriately by conducting an insufficient investigation into their allegations of an assault.

Relevant case law in determining if the RO's actions rise to the leve of misconduct under this section is "Hill v. Hamilton-Wentworth Regional Police Services Board". Which states "The standard of care of a reasonable police officer in similar circumstances should be applied in a manner that gives due recognition to the discretion inherent in police investigation. Police officers may make minor errors or errors in judgment without breaching the standard. This standard is flexible, covers all aspects of investigatory police work, and is reinforced by the nature and importance of police investigations."

The investigation found that the RO completed a sufficient investigation in to this matter. The RO took statements from the original complainant and a witness. They also were informed that further evidence was forthcoming.

Any investigative steps that the RO did not take, did not rise to the level misconduct required under Hill v. Hamilton-Wentworth Regional Police Services Board. The complainant was not present during the initial investigation and was not located on that evening.

Section 31 - Performance of Duties - Police officer shall not deceive or mislead any person in relation to the officer's duties
Unsubstantiated

The complainant alleges that the RO mislead the Justice of the Peace while applying for a warrant