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: [redacted]

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 Officer did not have the necessary grounds to apprehend her under Section 17 of the Mental Health Act. It was further alleged that the Respondent Officer used excessive force during the apprehension, belittled the Complainant, and spoke to her in an aggressive manner.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

CSPA 10 (1)
CSPA 11 (1)

Decision and Reasons

The Respondent Officer responded to a person in crisis call involving the Complainant. The Complainant made suicidal remarks and was not in the location she was expected to be. Upon locating the Complainant, the Respondent Officer challenged her on her location. The Complainant was irate and refused to safety plan. The Respondent Officer disengaged and two mental health workers tried to safety plan with the Complainant. When safety planning was unsuccessful, the Respondent Officer apprehended the Complainant under Section 17 of the Mental Health Act as she was believed to be a danger to herself. The Complainant was passively resistant and the Respondent Officer grabbed her by her arms and escorted her to the cruiser. Body-worn camera supported that the Respondent Officer was in the lawful execution of his duties and that the force used was reasonable and necessary.

Conclusion: There were not reasonable grounds to believe that the conduct of the Respondent Officers constituted misconduct.