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: 12/07/2025

Type of Investigation:

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

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint
It is alleged that the respondent officers failed to properly investigate a fraud, identifying it as a civil dispute. The complainant alleged that they further failed to promptly and diligently pursue indicators of possible financial exploitation. It is further alleged that the respondent officers failed to conduct a fair and impartial investigation by relying on unverified or false information from third parties, resulting in criminal charges being laid against the complainant and another individual.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Duty-Neglect or Omit - Sec 19 CSPA Reg. 407/23

Decision and Reasons

It was alleged that the respondent officers (ROs) failed to investigate potential criminal conduct and improperly treated the matter as civil in nature.

The evidence showed the respondent officers conducted follow-up inquiries, interviewed involved parties, and independently spoke with the affected party who was consistently assessed as capable of making their own decisions.

The affected party confirmed the relationship, financial arrangements, and consent regarding the vehicle. There was no evidence of fraud, coercion, incapacity, or lack of consent. The information available reasonably supported the conclusion that the matter was civil in nature.

It was further alleged that the respondent officers relied on false or unverified information, resulting in criminal charges against the complainant and an unfair investigation.

The evidence established that the respondent officers relied on direct observations, witness statements, admissions, physical evidence, and video evidence when investigating the incidents and laying charges. There was no evidence they relied on false information or ignored relevant evidence.

Upon review of the evidence and the duties of a police officer under section 82 of the Community Safety and Policing Act, there is no evidence to support the allegations of neglect. Accordingly, the allegations are unsubstantiated.