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: 2026-02-13

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 filed a harassment complaint with the respondent officer. The initial interaction with the respondent officer was professional and friendly. During the following week, the complainant had further contact with the respondent officer and observed a noticeable change in demeanour. The respondent officer became impatient and irritated with the complainant's urgency to solve the matter. The complainant stated that they were fearful for their safety due to the harassment coming from the president of a known outlaw motorcycle club and was eager to resolve the matter. The complainant spoke with the respondent officer after leaving several messages, the preceding days. The complainant stated that the respondent officer was very unprofessional, berated them on the phone, and accused them of speaking negatively about the respondent officer to co-workers. The complainant felt dismissed as a victim and believed that the respondent officer lacked empathy for victims of domestic violence.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation 1 – CSPA - Conduct undermines public trust
Allegation 2 – CSPA – Neglects to do Duty
Allegation 3 – CSPA – Insulting Language

Decision and Reasons

The investigation considered the complaint in the context of the Community Safety and Policing Act and the standards expected when officers interact with individuals reporting domestic violence concerns. The complainant provided a consistent and detailed account of the interaction, and their experience of the respondent officer's conduct as dismissive and lacking empathy is accepted as a genuine reflection of their perception. The respondent officer, however, denied any unprofessional behaviour and provided an alternative account indicating that appropriate follow-up and advice were given. While available evidence, including body-worn camera footage from the initial attendance, confirms the respondent officer acted professionally at that time, there is no recording or independent evidence of the subsequent telephone call that forms the basis of the complaint. In the absence of corroborative evidence, the investigation is unable to determine, on a balance of probabilities, that the alleged misconduct occurred. Accordingly, while the complainant's concerns are acknowledged as sincere, the evidence does not substantiate that the respondent officer's conduct amounted to misconduct under the Act.