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: May 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 C alleged the RO failed to investigate serious reported offences related to Intimate Partner Violence, failed to consider medical evidence, did not follow procedures for IPV and trafficking, that the and RO falsely reported that they spoke with the C about the conclusion of the matter when the RO did not.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

19 neglects to do duty
10 conduct undermines public trust
31 deceive or mislead
27 comply with procedures

Decision and Reasons

In conclusion, there is insufficient evidence to reasonably conclude the RO committed misconduct in relation to their handling of the investigation.

The RO acted within the guidelines of the law and [redacted] Directives, Policies and Procedures.

Investigative findings and officer statements do not support the complainants claims.

This investigation has found a lack of evidence to support what the complainant has claimed. Therefore, based on a review and analysis of the available information, the investigation has determined that there is insufficient evidence to establish that misconduct occurred.