**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: 12/01/2025

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 reported that they received a phone call from the Respondent Officer about an investigation that involved their ex-partner. The complainant believed they could hear an extra listener on the phone while they spoke about sensitive matters with the officer. They alleged that the officer leaked their legal information to their ex-partner. They said that their ex-partner bragged that they knew the information of their lawyer and subsequently convinced the lawyer to drop them, citing a conflict of interest. When the complainant spoke to a supervisor there was no report from the officer pertaining to any information concerning their ex-partner. |

## Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

CSPA O.Reg. 407/23, Section 10(1)

## Decision and Reasons

A statement was obtained by the officers in question, as well as the Complainant and a witness, their ex-partner. There is insufficient evidence to establish misconduct from either involved officer.

The allegation relies primarily on inference drawn from an indistinct background voice and subsequent assumptions regarding the sharing of information. This is contradicted by consistent and corroborated evidence from all other parties, as well as independent evidence confirming the presence of multiple radio transmissions at the relevant time.

The allegation is unsubstantiated.