**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: 03/12/2026

Type of Investigation:

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

Service Investigations Referred to:

| De-identified Summary of Complaint |
|---|
| Complainant alleges that RO1 and RO2 Neglected their duties in relation to an incident of fraud, reported by them. |

## Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Neglect To Do Duty - 19 of the Code of Conduct, Ontario Regulation 407/23, Community Safety and Policing Act of Ontario.

## Decision and Reasons

The record shows RO1 took prompt, documented action on the date in question: reviewed the complainant's voicemail, attempted a callback that went unanswered, successfully reached her by phone shortly after and discussed the matter directly, and within roughly ninety minutes generated a formal call for service and dispatched a uniformed officer to investigate the complainant's fraud complaint.

RO1 placed a call to the complainant's housing manager at their request, but was not successful in making contact. This is corroborated by service phone records. This was a courtesy beyond his role and falls outside of his statutory duties. The complainant had the means to substantiate her own circumstances with her housing manager by providing the police incident number directly.

RO2 attended promptly, conducted a thorough interview, attempted to assist in locating corroborating evidence, escalated the file appropriately to the specialized unit responsible for such matters, and left an open channel for further contact. The subsequent stall in the investigation is attributable to a lack of available evidence and investigative leads — a conclusion independently confirmed by the specialized unit's own review — not to any failure on RO2's part.

RO2's account that the complainant never provided further documentation she had been asked to supply is corroborated by phone records, which show her later calls to the front desk were not transferred to the officer's extension or voicemail, indicating no missed opportunity for follow-up on his end.