

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: Halton Regional Police

Date of Complaint: 06/20/2024

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 (C) stated the following:

- C's daughter has autism and is a victim of bullying, harassment, and defamation.
- The student who started the problems is transgender.
- C and her daughter met with the guidance counselor and vice principal. The vice principal became mad at the C because the C was misgendering the student. She was asked to leave.
- The police were called.
- The C told police what was going on.
- The C received a call from the Respondent Officer (RO) who had spoken to the students and parents.
- The RO became rude and said C would be arrested for criminal harassment if she contacted any of the students.
- The C contacted the police station to request the officer's name and badge number which she refused to provide.
- The C called and requested to speak to the Staff Sergeant. She was told the Staff Sergeant would not be speaking to her.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation 1 – Use of Insulting Language

It is alleged that the respondent officer was rude and told the complainant if she contacted a particular person again, she would be arrested for criminal harassment.

Allegation 2 – Fail to provide Identifying Information

Decision and Reasons

Allegation 1 – Use of Insulting Language

Although the C alleged that the RO was rude to her over the phone, she does not describe any language on the part of the RO that could reasonably be considered insulting, abusive, or profane. Although RO allegedly hung up on C, without further context, this act alone would not rise to the level of misconduct under the CSPA. There was no further evidence to consider. This allegation was unsubstantiated.

Allegation 2 – Fail to provide Identifying Information

The C also alleged that the RO refused to provide her name and badge number. The C did not receive a response from RO despite immediately calling her back and sending two text messages. C also attempted to speak with a Staff Sergeant but was refused. This could constitute a failure to provide identifying information upon request. The investigator was able to review voice messages and the RO clearly states her name on two occasions. Other evidence reviewed supports the RO's position that she provided information the previous day. There was insufficient evidence to support this allegation. This allegation is unsubstantiated.

Allegation 3 – Negligently performance of duties

A thorough review of the following items was conducted by the investigator: occurrences related to this matter, the Computer Aided Dispatch history for the RO in relation to this matter, reports and notebook entries completed by the officer at the time of their contact with the complainant, the ingoing and outgoing calls on the RO's work-issued cell phone, the RO's compelled statement and a telephone interview with the complainant. The investigator considered relevant policies, procedures and the training of the RO. There was insufficient evidence to suggest that the RO neglected to do their duty. This allegation is unsubstantiated.