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:

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 on March 4, 2026, members of the service responded to a call for an individual experiencing a mental health crisis and had threatening to commit suicide. Once Officers had gained control of the situation and the individual had been placed in handcuffs, the Respondent Officer approached them without warning or prior communication and physically pushed them into a brick wall, causing their head to strike the wall resulting in pain. The Complainant further alleges that no verbal direction, warning, or explanation was provided before, during, or after the use of force.

As a result of the incident, the Complainant reports experiencing ongoing pain to the head and neck, emotional distress, difficulty sleeping, and a diminished level of trust and confidence in police.

The Complainant maintains that the force used against them was unnecessary, unprovoked, and unjustified given that they were not interfering with the officers' actions at the time of the incident.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Unnecessary or excessive use of force

Decision and Reasons

The Body-worn-Camera footage was reviewed and found that it does not corroborate the allegations by the complainant.

Police were on scene as a result of a call for assistance. The physical contact was minimal and no contact was made by the complainant and the wall at anytime during the interaction. The Officers were in the lawful execution of their duties regarding an apprehension of the subject under the Mental Health Act., as they were in crisis and a potential harm to themselves and others.

The complainant attempted to communicate with the subject and refused to comply with officer's demands that they move away from the immediate area. By yelling, the complainant was interfering with officer's duties, jeopardizing officers and the subject's safety.

The Responding Officer acted in accordance with all governing authorities and the action required to be immediate and effective.

The force was found to be proportionate to the circumstances and necessary for everyone's safety.