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: 11/24/2025

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 she was unlawfully arrested by the Respondent Officers (RO)s despite having committed no criminal offence at the time, further alleging the ROs used excessive force during the course of her arrest.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

RESPONDENT OFFICER 1
Public-Unlawful Arrest - Sec 7 CSPA Reg. 407/23
Public – Unnecessary Force – Sec 11 CSPA Reg. 407/23

RESPONDENT OFFICER 2
Public-Unlawful Arrest - Sec 7 CSPA Reg. 407/23
Public – Unnecessary Force – Sec 11 CSPA Reg. 407/23

Decision and Reasons

Allegation 1 – Unlawful Arrest (Against RO1 and RO2)
It was alleged that RO1 and RO2 unlawfully arrested the Complainant on April 27, 2025, without lawful authority for the offences of Public Mischief and Resisting Arrest.

The evidence showed that RO1 developed reasonable and probable grounds to arrest the Complainant after she placed multiple 911 and non-emergency calls within minutes of receiving a formal misuse of 911 warning, giving RO1 lawful authority to charge her with Public Mischief. When the Complainant later left her residence and stepped onto a public sidewalk, both RO1 and RO2 were lawfully positioned to effect the arrest, and once arrested, the Complainant was advised of the reason, read her right to counsel, given the police caution, and afforded an opportunity to speak with duty counsel at the detachment. The subsequent withdrawal of charges occurred only after the Complainant agreed to participate in a diversionary direct accountability program—a process that the Crown may only offer when a reasonable prospect of conviction exists—further confirming the arrest was supported by reasonable grounds. Therefore, the allegation of Unlawful Arrest was unsubstantiated.

Allegation 2 – Unnecessary Force (Against RO1 and RO2)
It was alleged that RO1 and RO2 used excessive or unnecessary force during the Complainant's arrest on April 27, 2025.

The evidence showed that the Complainant displayed both active and passive resistance during the arrest, including pulling away from RO1, refusing repeated commands to release her dog's leash, dropping to her knees, and later refusing to stand or walk to the police vehicle, which required RO1 and RO2 to assist her by holding her arms and partially carrying or dragging her to the cruiser. Under Section 25 of the Criminal Code and OPP use of force training standards, these behaviours permitted officers to use soft physical control techniques to gain control and facilitate movement, and the video evidence confirmed the officers used only minimal force directed toward completing the arrest. There was no evidence supporting the Complainant's claim that she was kicked, and the bruising she later reported was consistent with lawful arm control techniques rather