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: 06/09/2025

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 alleged that the Respondent Officers (RO) failed to properly investigate an Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) incident, allowed their ex common law partner to remain in and retain access to his residence without lawful colour of right, providing their opportunity to commit theft and damage property. Further the RO left their child in the care of an unfit parent and failed to take action to remove the ex common law partner from the residence despite being provided with supporting documentation.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

RO 1 and 2
Duty – Neglect or Omit - Sec 19 CSPA Reg. 407/23

RO 3
Public- Undermine Public Trust - Sec 10 CSPA Reg. 407/23
Duty – Neglect or Omit - Sec 19 CSPA Reg. 407/23

RO 4 and 5
Neglect of Duty – Sec. 2(1)(c) PSA Reg. 268/10

Decision and Reasons

RO 1 and 2
Duty – Neglect or Omit – Sec. 19 CSPA Reg. 407/23

The evidence supported that the ROs acted appropriately and within their authority. They did not neglect their duties, as the applicable policies and procedures related to the allegation had been properly followed. Although the complainant believed police intervention was required, the officers' authority to act had been limited, and they were not permitted to engage in civil matters. There were no reasonable grounds to support that the ROs were neglectful.

RO 3
Public – Undermine Public Trust – Sec. 10 CSPA Reg. 407/23
Duty – Neglect or Omit – Sec. 19 CSPA Reg. 407/23

The evidence supported that the RO had been thorough in the investigation. The complainant's request fell outside the scope of police authority, and there had been no lawful basis for the officer to intervene. As such, there were no reasonable grounds to support that the RO neglected their duties. Further, the RO's actions had been lawful and consistent with their training and responsibilities to victims of crime. Their conduct had been reasonable and did not rise to the level of misconduct. There were no reasonable grounds to support the allegation of undermining public trust.

RO 4 and 5
Neglect of Duty – Sec. 2(1)(c) PSA Reg. 268/10

The evidence supported that the ROs lawfully attended the residence and followed applicable policies and procedures in relation to the complainant retrieving personal property. There was no evidence to suggest that the complainant had been attempting to initiate a criminal investigation. There was insufficient evidence to support that the ROs neglected their duties.