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: 05/29/2026

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service: ◉ Referred to Other Service: ○ Retained by LECA: ○

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

On August 19, 2023, members of the [redacted] commenced a mischief over $5000 investigation - Intimate Partner related, resulting in the Complainant being arrested and charged for Mischief Under $5000.

The matter proceeded through the court process and was eventually withdrawn at the discretion of the Crown in February 2026.

The Complainant alleges that the involved officers completed a negligent investigation when they colluded with the victim of the mischief, failed to investigate a sexual assault allegation she raised, and sought a warrant for her arrest on false information. The complainant believes that the officers were biased and discriminated against her due to protected grounds under the Code.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation #1
Neglect of Duty – fail to perform duty,
Section 2(1)(c)(i) - A police officer commits misconduct when he or she, without lawful excuse, neglects or omits promptly and diligently to perform a duty as a member of the police force of which the officer is a member.

Allegation #2
Neglect of Duty – fail to perform duty,

Decision and Reasons

Allegation #1

Neglect of Duty – fail to perform duty,
Section 2(1)(c)(i) - A police officer commits misconduct when he or she, without lawful excuse, neglects or omits promptly and diligently to perform a duty as a member of the police force of which the officer is a member.

Respondent Officer 1 (RO1)
Respondent Officer 2 (RO2)
Respondent Officer 3 (RO3)
Respondent Officer 4 (RO4)

Finding: This investigation has revealed the officers were in the lawful performance of their duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities. The officers involved completed a proper investigation both in the initial stages and throughout the overall investigation. The charges were laid based on information received from witnesses and supporting evidence, although no formal statements were taken. The matter did not reach trial because of the discretion of the assigned crown attorney and at no fault of the respondent officers involved.

Based on the available information, the Investigator has concluded that there is insufficient evidence to establish reasonable grounds that misconduct has occurred. Therefore, the allegation is unsubstantiated.

Allegation #2

Neglect of Duty – fail to perform duty,
Section 2(1)(c)(i) - A police officer commits misconduct when he or she, without lawful excuse, neglects or omits promptly and diligently to perform a duty as a member of the