

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: 05/02/2024 | |
|--|-------------------------------|-------------------|
| 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 alleges he and his investigation and did not provide him | | |
| | | |
| | | |

LECA 2024 Page 1 of 2



Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

| Performance of Duties Section 19 | | |
|--|--|--|
| Undermine Public Trust Section 10(1) | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| Decision and Reasons | | |
| The Respondent Officer investigated the Complainant's report of being assaulted. The Respondent Officer determined there was no reasonable prospect of a conviction and used his discretion to choose not to take further action. The Complainant was the initial instigator in this matter. | | |
| The Respondent Officer did not immediately contact and update the Complaint of his investigation. The Respondent Officer did eventually contact the Complainant and update him. The delay in contacting the Complainant would not be considered misconduct. | | |
| | | |
| | | |

LECA Page 2 of 2