**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: 12/04/2024

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 the involved Police Officers falsified information in their notes and the report, to "cover up" crimes against his son and protect the perpetrators. The Complainant alleges the involved Police Officer(s) failed to properly investigate a historical sexual assault. The Complainant alleges the involved Police Officer(s) failed to properly investigate historical animal abuse. |

## Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

1. Corrupt Practice - s. 16(1)
2. Neglect of Duty - s. 19
3. Neglect of Duty - s. 19

## Decision and Reasons

1. Corrupt Practice - Notes, reports, body worn camera footage, and recorded interviews were reviewed. There is no evidence that the involved officers falsified information or engaged in conduct that would "cover up" crimes (prevent the administration of justice). There is no evidence that the involved officers know anyone related to the alleged crimes. There is no evidence the officers engaged in conduct to protect or benefit people involved in the alleged crimes.

2. Neglect of Duty - Relevant legislation, police procedures, and protocols were reviewed. Notes, reports, body worn camera footage, and recorded interviews were reviewed. The investigation determined the officers actions were consistent with relevant legislation and governance. The officer's conduct does not support the allegations they failed to perform their duties appropriately.

3. Neglect of Duty - Relevant legislation, police procedures, and protocols were reviewed. Notes, reports, body worn camera footage, and recorded interviews were reviewed. The investigation determined the officers actions were consistent with relevant legislation and governance. The officer's conduct does not support the allegations they failed to perform their duties appropriately.

Conclusion: The Chief of Police does not have reasonable grounds to believe the involved Police Officers engaged in misconduct.