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: 04/02/2026

Type of Investigation:

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

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint
On February 23rd, 2026, the complainant was operating a motor vehicle and was involved in a motor vehicle collision with another vehicle. The two respondent officers, from here on in referred to as RO1 and RO2, responded to the collision scene while on duty. The complainant alleged ROs neglected their duty while investigating the motor vehicle collision.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

CSPA - Section 19 - Fail to Perform Duties

Decision and Reasons

The complainant experienced significant delays in her insurance claim process for her damaged vehicle. The investigation was not privy to insurance company claim process and the reasons on why that was the case. The insurance company is a separate private entity, not bound by police directions or investigations. Although the complainant believed and felt the delay was solely based on how RO1 and RO2 conducted the investigation, this is an unreasonable assumption at this point.

RO1 and RO2 carried out the core duties expected of them. While the investigation detected and rectified an oversight by RO2 failing to follow up with a witness, evidence indicated this was an investigative deficiency rather than misconduct. The allegation by the complainant is therefore unsubstantiated.