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: 07/29/2026

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 alleges that during an interaction with police, the Respondent Officer forcefully squeezed her arms after she had injured her throat with her key. She states that, after telling the officer to let go and believing he would not release her, she spit toward his face. The complainant further alleges that the officer then pushed her to the ground face first, went on top of her from behind, and that she called out for help before another person came outside. She reports that the Respondent Officer stated that everything was okay, but then handcuffed her tightly enough that she could barely feel her fingers and transported her to the emergency department with only her keys. The complainant also states that approximately two days later, a large bruise appeared on her upper right arm.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation 1 – Undermines Public Trust -CSPA O.Reg 407/23 sec. 10
A police officer shall not conduct themselves in a manner that undermines, or is likely to undermine, public trust in policing.

Allegation 2 – Unnecessary Force – CSPA O.Reg 407/23 sec. 11
A police officer shall no use any more force than is necessary given the circumstances.

Decision and Reasons

Based on the totality of the evidence, there are insufficient reasonable grounds to substantiate that the Respondent Officer conducted himself in a manner that undermined public trust or used unnecessary force. The officer was lawfully engaged in a mental health apprehension, acted to prevent further self-harm, and used a level of physical control that was necessary, proportional, and reasonable in the circumstances. His actions were consistent with the Criminal Code, the Mental Health Act, and [redacted] policy.
Although the officer's actions were found to be correct and justified, the complainant expressed that she would like the officer spoken to about being more sensitive to the needs of persons experiencing a mental health crisis. That requested outcome is noted. It may be appropriate for the officer to be reminded of the importance of compassionate communication, where circumstances permit, while recognizing that the evidence does not establish misconduct in this matter.