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: 2026-07-22

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service: ◉ Referred to Other Service: ○ Retained by LECA: ○

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

On July 22, 2026, the Law Enforcement Complaints Agency (LECA) received a complaint regarding the conduct of the respondent officer (RO) during an unrelated call for service. The complainant alleged that, while passing the RO with her young daughter, who has a visible disability, the RO made a comment comparing the child to a "wounded animal." The complainant believed the comment was directed at her daughter's disability and perceived it as insensitive, disrespectful, and lacking compassion. The complainant reported that the remark caused her significant emotional distress and raised concerns about how her daughter may be perceived and treated by others in the future.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation 1 – CSPA – Conduct Undermines Public Trust - Unsubstantiated
Allegation 2 – CSPA – Insulting Language - Unsubstantiated

Decision and Reasons

The investigation determined that the Respondent Officer (RO) used the words “injured dog” and “injured animal” when referring to the complainant’s child; however, the evidence established that the comments were the result of an honest but mistaken belief that the child was engaged in make-believe play or was potentially injured, rather than any intent to insult, demean, or discriminate. The investigation found no evidence that the comments were racially motivated, malicious, or deliberately disrespectful. Body-worn camera footage confirmed that, upon learning the child had a disability, the RO immediately recognized the offence caused, accepted responsibility, remained on scene to address the complainant’s concerns, and apologized repeatedly, including directly to the child. The evidence demonstrated that the RO acted in good faith, showed genuine remorse, and made significant efforts to repair the harm caused by her comments. While the complainant was understandably offended and experienced emotional distress, the investigation concluded that the RO’s actions amounted to a genuine mistake and poor judgment rather than misconduct under sections 10 (Conduct that Undermines Public Trust) or 12 (Insulting Language) of the Community Safety and Policing Act. Accordingly, both allegations were determined to be unsubstantiated.