

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: 07/10/2024

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 alleged that a [REDACTED] Police Service ([REDACTED]) officer did not have the grounds to arrest her for Public Intoxication and was simply the result of animosity the officer had towards her from a previous, unrelated interaction.

The Complainant further alleged the [REDACTED] officer used excessive force during the arrest, throwing her up against the cruiser and applying handcuffs so tight, it caused bruising to her wrists.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

1. Performance of Duties (Neglects to do Duty) - sec. 19
2. Interactions with the Public (Unnecessary Force) - sec. 11(1)
3. Interactions with the Public (Conduct Undermines Public Trust) - sec. 10(1)

Decision and Reasons

Allegation #1:

A 9-1-1 call was placed by the occupants of a [REDACTED] residence to remove two aggressive individuals trespassing on their property. The Complainant was one of the individuals and appeared to be under the influence of alcohol and/or drugs.

The [REDACTED] officer escorted the Complainant from the property without incident and remedied the reason for the 9-1-1 call being placed.

The actions of the officer did not support this allegation of Neglect of Duty.

Allegation #2:

The [REDACTED] officer was equipped with Body Worn Video (BWV). The BWV footage debunked the Complainant's claims. The handcuffs were applied gently and she was placed against the cruiser in a similar fashion. The level of force utilized was appropriate.

The actions of the officer did not support this allegation of Unnecessary Force,

Allegation #3:

The Complainant was observed by the [REDACTED] officer acting aggressive in a public setting and clear signs of alcohol intoxication had been present. Objective grounds existed to arrest the Complainant for Public Intoxication.

The actions of the officer did not support this allegation of incivility.

CONCLUSION: The Chief did not have reasonable grounds to believe that the actions of the WRPS officer constituted misconduct.