**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:

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 alleged the RO failed to properly investigate the alleged threats and assault . She further alleged the RO used threats and pressure to obtain a statement, discouraged access to legal counsel, and provided misleading information.

The complainant further alleged the RO applied handcuffs too tightly.

## Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

1) Fails to Perform Duties S. 19 CSPA
2) Unnecessary Force S. 11 CSPA

## Decision and Reasons

The respondent officer was engaged in a call for service. The information provided to him was believed to be credible and his actions were in good faith.

The information available throughout the course of the investigation did not substantiate the allegations made by the complainant.

There was no basis or information to substantiate misconduct on the part of the respondent officers.