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: 03/10/2026

Type of Investigation:

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

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint
The complainant alleged the respondent officers, failed to complete a motor vehicle report correctly and also failed to return telephone calls.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Section 19: Neglects to do duty

Decision and Reasons

The Respondent Officer (RO1), in documenting the incident, considered the actions of both the complainant and the driver of the motor vehicle. Based on the totality of the circumstances, RO1 identified the complainant as D1.

At no point was the complainant knocked to the ground from his e-bike. There was no damage to either the e-bike or the motor vehicle. The complainant's injury was assessed as minor, and he continued his journey following the collision.

RO1 exercised discretion and elected not to pursue charges against either party.

RO2 was not RO1's supervisor. The complainant was subsequently contacted by RO1's supervisor.

There is insufficient evidence to support a finding of misconduct against either Respondent Officer.