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: 02/25/2026

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 has alleged that the Respondent Officers did not conduct a thorough investigation, and that they didn't take appropriate action in response to his radio call. He has further alleged that the Respondent Officers coerced the Complainant into paying the other involved party as a result of him disposing of their property.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation #1 - Performance of Duties s. 19 Neglect of duty

Allegation #2 - Interactions with the Public s. 10(1) Undermine public trust

Decision and Reasons

This investigation has revealed the officers were in the lawful performance of their duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities. The RO’s listened to the Complainant and then corroborated the former tenant’s version of the events, that he had authority from his former landlord to store his property at the unit, and that he had returned with permission to obtain said property. Additionally, the Complainant admitted to disposing of the former tenant's property without any authority to do so. The Complainant was advised by the RO's, and agreed that disposing of the former tenant’s property was a criminal offence. Both parties were given three options as to how the situation could be resolved and they both agreed to the resolution of financial compensation.