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
On January 5, 2026, the Complainant, attended the residence of a friend who had been incarcerated since November 28, 2025. Upon arrival, he observed that the locks had been changed; however, he was able to gain entry using a master access code. Inside the residence, he noted that several items were missing. The Complainant reviewed video footage from the property and formed the belief that his friend's former partner was responsible for removing the items. He subsequently contacted 911 to report the incident. The Respondent Officer responded to the call by speaking with the Complainant. The Complainant alleges that Respondent Officer failed to attend the residence to assess potential safety concerns and formed conclusions regarding the matter prematurely without conducting an in-person investigation.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

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

Decision and Reasons

A review of the evidence showed that Complainant called to report a break and enter that occurred 38 days prior too, had already been in the residence and had cameras that showed the person who entered also had color of right to be there. There was no outstanding safety concerns identified and the matter was deemed to be civil in nature.