

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: [REDACTED] Date of Complaint: 08/10/2024

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, filed this complainant with the Law Enforcement Complaints Agency (LECA) on June 10th, 2024, with an Early Resolution outcome possible. On September 23, 2024, the complaint was referred to the [REDACTED] Police Service ([REDACTED]) for investigation.

On June 10, 2024, the complainant contacted the [REDACTED] as he believed he was a victim of a fraud/identity fraud.

The complainant had a conversation with the responding officer about why he felt he was being defrauded.

The complainant believes that the responding officer was not understanding his concerns and proceeded to speak with people who did not contact the police.

The responding officer told the complainant that he has mental health issues and everyone in the Service knows, and that if he contacts the [REDACTED] no service will be provided.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation 1 – Conduct Undermines Public Trust Section 10

A police officer shall not conduct themselves in a manner that undermines, or is likely to undermine, public trust in policing.

It is alleged that the responding officer undermined public trust by saying the complainant has mental health issues and that if he made another complaint the [REDACTED] would not be attending.

Decision and Reasons

Allegation 1 – Conduct Undermines Public Trust Section 10

A police officer shall not conduct themselves in a manner that undermines, or is likely to undermine, public trust in policing.

It is alleged that the responding officer undermined public trust by saying the complainant has mental health issues and that if he made another complaint the [REDACTED] would not be attending.

Based on the evidence obtained and the analysis outlined above, the PSU investigation found that the conduct of the responding officer does not undermine public trust.

Although the responding officer did refer to the complainants mental health, it was not meant to be uncivil, unprofessional or demeaning to the complainant.

The responding officer did mention that he would notify dispatch not to send an officer if the complainant called back to report the same identity fraud. The responding officer was attempting to explain that there was no reason for police to attend as there was no evidence the complainant was a victim of identity fraud. The responding officer did say that if more evidence is collected by the complainant, he could call the [REDACTED] and report the identity fraud at that time.

After reviewing all the evidence, this investigation was completed in full and without bias or discrimination.