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: 02/02/2026

Type of Investigation:

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

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint
The Complainant alleged the Respondent Officer failed to conduct a thorough Motor Vehicle Collision (MVC) investigation and improperly completed the Collision Report.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Duty-Neglect or Omit – Sec 19 CSPA Reg. 407/23

Decision and Reasons

Duty-Neglect or Omit – Sec 19 CSPA Reg. 407/23

The Complainant alleged the Respondent Officer failed to conduct a thorough MVC by not taking their statement at the scene, relying on limited information from the involved parties, and not pursuing charges against the vehicle owner. The Complainant further alleged that their motor vehicle was towed unnecessarily, that they did not receive a collision report in a timely manner or with sufficient information, and that the Respondent Officer failed to provide them with identifying information of the other driver and owner of the other vehicle or return their property in a reasonable manner.

The investigator reviewed officers reports, notes, witness statements, Body Worn Camera Footage, Call Taker and Dispatch Audio Recordings, Police Service Policy, the Ministry of Transportation Collision Reporting Manual, the Highway Traffic Act, the Compulsory Automobile Insurance Act, and Case Law Korchinski v. Office of the Independent Police Review Director (2022).

The Investigator concluded the Respondent Officer actively investigated the collision by attending the scene, speaking with involved parties, obtaining statements, conducting follow-up inquiries, forming grounds, and issuing charges. The Respondent Officer exercised lawful discretion, acted within policy, and completed the required investigative steps in a reasonable and timely manner, and was professional during his encounters with the Complainant.