**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: 05/18/2024

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 that the Respondent Officers came into her residence without her permission or lawful authority. The Respondent Officers then used excessive force while handcuffing the Complainant. The Complainant alleges they did not have the grounds to apprehend her under the Mental Health Act. |

## Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Unlawful Arrest Section 7 (1)
Unnecessary Force Section 11 (1)

## Decision and Reasons

Unlawful Arrest Section 7 (1)

This investigation has revealed the officers were in the lawful performance of their duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities. The Respondent Officers conducted a proper investigation out of concern of the Complainant's well-being. Ultimately, the Complainant refused to tell the Respondent Officers the amount of prescription pills she consumed and the observations the Civilian Witnesses observed of the Complainant were enough grounds to apprehend the Complainant to ensure her safety.
The Investigator has concluded that there is insufficient evidence to establish reasonable grounds that misconduct has occurred.

Unnecessary Force Section 11 (1)

This investigation has revealed the officers were in the lawful performance of their duties and acted in accordance with all governing authorities. The Respondent Officers' use of force was minimal and consistent with the use of force Training Aid and their use of force training.
The Investigator has concluded that there is insufficient evidence to establish reasonable grounds that misconduct has occurred.