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: 04/12/2026

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 on April 12th, 2026, the respondent officers actions undermined the public trust and they neglected their duties when they responded to a Person on Crisis call at his residence.
The complainant alleged respondent officers were insensitive and were focused on making an apprehension.
The complainant also alleged the respondent officers failed to ensure the Person In Crisis understood what was occurring during their investigation, due to a language barrier.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation 1 – CONDUCT UNDERMINES PUBLIC TRUST – Section 10(1)

Allegation 2 - NEGLECTS TO DO DUTY – Section 19

Decision and Reasons

Allegation 1 – CONDUCT UNDERMINES PUBLIC TRUST – Section 10(1)
The investigation determined their was no evidence to support the complainant's allegation that the respondent officers acted in an appropriate manner when they explained to him how they would conduct their investigation to determine if an apprehension was required under the Mental Health Act.

The investigation determined the allegation was unsubstantiated.

Allegation 2 - NEGLECTS TO DO DUTY – Section 19

The investigation determined their was no evidence to support the complainant's allegation that the respondent officers failed to conduct a proper investigation. The respondent officers utilized a translation service to ensure the person allegedly in crisis completely understood their inquiries. The respondent officers determined there were no grounds to support an apprehension under the Mental Health Act.

The investigation determined the allegation was unsubstantiated.