[redacted]

Law Enforcement Complaints Agency Ontario

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: [redacted]

Date of Complaint: 04/14/2025

Type of Investigation:

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

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint
On Wednesday March 19, 2025, the Complainant alleges that he had an interaction with the Respondent Officer at the intersection [redacted]. The Complainant alleges that the Respondent Officer cut him off in the crosswalk using his police vehicle and was aggressive, disrespectful, and unprofessional during the interaction.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation #1 - Interactions with the Public; Undermine Public Trust

Allegation #2 - Interactions with the Public; Incivility

Decision and Reasons

Allegation #1

Interactions with the Public; Undermine Public Trust

• The Complainant alleges RO1 berated the Complainant and was aggressive during the interaction.

Finding: The investigation determined that insufficient evidence exists to conclude on reasonable grounds that RO1 was aggressive during his interaction with the Complainant.
The Complainant was found to be credible and truthful that a heated exchange occurred between him and RO1, however the causal factor was disputed by both parties, and independent witnesses and or surveillance video did not assist the investigation. Based on the available information, the Investigator has found that insufficient evidence exists to conclude that RO1's behaviour rose to the threshold of misconduct. Therefore, the allegation is Unsubstantiated.

Allegation #2

Interactions with the Public; Incivility

• The Complainant alleges RO1 was disrespectful and unprofessional during the interaction.
Finding: The investigation determined that insufficient evidence exists to conclude on reasonable grounds that RO1 was profane or otherwise uncivil during his interaction with the Complainant.
The investigator concluded that both parties perceived the incident differently, and both provided credible accounts of what was perceived to have occurred. Independent witnesses were aware that interaction had occurred, even so far as to refer to it as "heated", however no substantive details could be provided, and no evidence revealed RO1 to be profane or uncivil. Based on the available information, the Investigator has found that insufficient evidence exists to conclude that RO1's behaviour rose to the threshold of misconduct. Therefore, the allegation is Unsubstantiated.