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: 05/03/2026

Type of Investigation:

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

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint
It was alleged that on [date], the respondent officer committed misconduct in that, the officer repeatedly made unnecessary phone calls to the complainant, at an inconvenient time, about a matter that did not involve the complainant. Calling four (4) times within a minute while the complainant was out of province. It was also alleged that on [date], the respondent officer committed misconduct in that, he used abusive and insulting language.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation 1 – UNDERMINE PUBLIC TRUST – Section 10(1)1 A police officer shall not conduct themselves in a manner that undermines, or is likely to undermine, public trust in policing
It is alleged that on [date], the respondent officer committed misconduct in that, the officer repeatedly made unnecessary phone calls, at an inconvenient time, about a matter that did not involve the complainant
Allegation 2 – INSULTING LANGUAGE – Section 12(1)2 A police officer shall not use abusive language, or treat any person in a manner that is abusive
It is alleged that on [date], the respondent officer committed misconduct in that, the officer used abusive and insulting language.

Decision and Reasons

Allegation 1- The respondent officer was called to investigate a domestic dispute concerning the well-being of an elderly person. It was the officers duty to conduct a timely investigation into the matter. The respondent officer called the complainant (who was a direct relative) to check on the well being of the elderly person. This task in the chain of events was a reasonable and proper thing to do. Although the officer did not know the complainant resided in another province, it was a reasonable time of day to call regardless. The respondent officer called four times within a minute (at 1:31PM, 1:31PM, 1:32PM and 1:32PM) before contact was made, due to lost connections from the cell-to-cell phone calls. This was a reasonable explanation for the multiple calls.

Allegation 2- The complainant alleged the respondent officer used vulgar/abusive language which was denied by the officer. A witness officer was beside the respondent officer when the phone call was put on speaker-phone. The witness officer could only hear the complainant yelling and did not hear the respondent officer use any vulgar language as alleged. The investigation failed to produce any evidence to support the allegation.