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: 06/01/2026

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 that the Respondent Officer took her complaint, reviewed evidence, and made a poor decision by choosing to not lay criminal charges. The Respondent Officer then destroyed a USB drive that contained video provided by the complainant and did not return the USB drive.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Ontario Regulation 407/23 of the Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019:

19 Neglects to do Duty
10 Conduct Undermines Public Trust

Decision and Reasons

The Respondent Officer spoke to the complainant and the other involved party in relation to the complaint of damage caused to a vehicle. The Respondent Officer reviewed video provided by the complainant and determined that the video did not provide conclusive evidence or grounds for a charge. It was also determined that the damaged property in question, was not owned by the complainant.

Advice was given to all involved on how to proceed in the future. The incident was documented and the USB drive containing the video was destroyed, as the complainant provided the video as a copy from their cloud storage.

The concern of the complainants property being discarded was discussed with the Respondent Officer and they were reminded of property guidelines under our current Operating Procedure.

The Respondent Officer was not neglectful, and made the appropriate determination based on the evidence gathered.