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: 02/04/2026

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 she was in contact with two police officers, During her interactions with both officers, The complainant believes both neglected their duties during an active criminal investigation by expressing their bias, made threatening statements.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation #1

Interactions with the Public

Section 10 (1) Undermine Public Trust

A police officer shall not conduct themselves in a manner that undermines, or is likely to undermine, public trust in policing

Decision and Reasons

Allegation #1

Interactions with the Public

Section 10 (1) Undermine Public Trust

A police officer shall not conduct themselves in a manner that undermines, or is likely to undermine, public trust in policing

• It is alleged the Respondent Officers interrogated and threatened the complainant, along with expressing their bias during the investigation

Respondent Officer 1 (RO1)
Respondent Officer 2 (RO2)

Finding: This investigation has revealed the officers were in the lawful performance of their duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities. The complainant alleges their investigations were biased against her and she was threatened while interrogated. In all evidence collected by the investigator, there is no evidence to believe the complainant was interrogated nor did either officer express a bias. The evidence shows both officers conducting a full, frank and fair investigation, as required.

Based on the available information, the Investigator has concluded that there is insufficient evidence to establish reasonable grounds that misconduct has occurred.

Therefore, the allegation is unsubstantiated.
