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:

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 two Ottawa Police officers, RO1 and RO2, entered his apartment, used unnecessary force during his detention, handcuffed him, and tackled him after he was already restrained. He was not charged with any offence. He was transported to hospital against his wishes, and experienced further mistreatment there. He reported suffering a fractured hand and ongoing psychological effects.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

CSPA - Section 11 - Unnecessary Force

Decision and Reasons

RO1 and RO2 lawfully entered the residence to investigate the assault. RO1 and RO2 formed grounds to apprehend the complainant under section 17 of the Mental Health Act. RO1 and RO2 were authorized to use reasonable force necessary to affect the apprehension and maintain control of the situation.

RO1 and RO2 both documented and described the complainant's resistance to the apprehension and lack of cooperation. As a result, officers were authorized to apply reasonable physical control techniques and handcuffing to safely complete the apprehension and prevent further escalation.

The evidence showed RO1 and RO1 acted within their lawful authority under both the MHA and Criminal Code, and the force use was reasonably necessary to carry out the apprehension. The allegation of unnecessary force is therefore unsubstantiated.