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: 04/10/2026

Type of Investigation:

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

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

Allegation #1 – Duty – Neglect or Omit by RO1

The complainant alleged that RO1 neglected or omitted their duty by not conducting a complete and thorough investigation into the reported fraud.

Allegation #2 – Public – Undermine Public Trust by RO2

The complainant alleged that RO2 acted in a manner that undermined public trust by speaking to the complainant in a rude, confrontational, and unprofessional manner during a telephone conversation regarding the fraud complaint.

Allegation #3 – Duty – Neglect or Omit by RO2

The complainant alleged that RO2 neglected or omitted their duty by failing to properly address, investigate, or take action regarding the fraud complaint.

Allegation #4 – Public – Undermine Public Trust by RO3

The complainant alleged that RO3 acted in a way that would undermine public trust by showing bias against the complainant while investigating a threats complaint.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

RO1
Duty-Neglect or Omit - Sec 19 CSPA Reg. 407/23

RO2
Public-Undermine Public Trust - Sec 10 CSPA Reg. 407/23
Duty-Neglect or Omit - Sec 19 CSPA Reg. 407/23

RO3
[illegible]

Decision and Reasons

Allegation #1 – Neglect or Omit Duty by RO1

The complainant alleged that RO1 neglected or omitted to do their duty by failing to conduct a complete and thorough investigation into the fraud complaint.

Section 19 of Ontario Regulation 407/23 under the Community Safety and Policing Act provides that a police officer shall not fail to perform their duties without lawful excuse where they know, or reasonably ought to know, that their actions or omissions would amount to a failure to perform their duties appropriately.

The evidence showed that RO1 responded to the complaint on June 30, 2025, and immediately commenced an investigation into the allegations of fraud involving the local fire department. RO1 attended the residence of the complainant and obtained information from the complainant and a family member, reviewed and photographed the documents provided, and remained at the residence for over an hour gathering relevant information. RO1 subsequently conducted follow-up inquiries with a municipal administrator, who advised that both internal and independent third-party reviews of the payroll process had been completed and had identified no evidence of fraud, mismanagement, or missing funds.

In assessing the complaint, RO1 considered whether the available evidence supported the offence of fraud as outlined in section 380 of the Criminal Code. RO1 reviewed the information provided by the complainant, including concerns regarding payroll discrepancies. The evidence revealed that a previous payroll discrepancy involving a family member of the complainant had been identified and corrected by the municipality. However, no evidence was provided demonstrating intentional deception, fraudulent activity, or personal financial gain by the departmental supervisor. RO1 therefore determined that there were no reasonable grounds to believe that a criminal offence had occurred.

In R. v. Storrey, [1990] 1 S.C.R. 241, the Supreme Court of Canada held that reasonable and