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: 05/03/2024

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 [Police Service] officer told the Complainant to leave the police station without a reason. The Complainant also alleged that another [Police Service] officer refused to help them.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

1. Conduct themselves in a manner that undermines, or is likely to undermine, public trust in policing, contrary to section 10(1) of the Community Safety and Policing Act (Ontario Regulation 407/23).

2. By act or omission, fail to perform their duties appropriately without lawful excuse if, at the time, they know or reasonably ought to know that their act or omission would amount to a failure to perform their duties appropriately, contrary to section 19 of the Community Safety and Policing Act (Ontario Regulation 407/23).

Decision and Reasons

1. Conduct undermines public trust: There was no evidence as a result of investigation that the officer acted in a manner that undermined or was likely to undermine public trust in policing. The actions of the offer did not support the allegation of acting in a disorderly manner.

2. Neglect to do Duty: Applicable procedures were reviewed. The investigation determined that the officer followed procedures. The actions of the officer did not support the allegation the officer failed to perform their duties appropriately.

CONCLUSION: The Chief of Police did not have reasonable grounds to believe that the conduct of the [Police Service] constituted misconduct.