

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: 06/11/2024

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service:

Referred to Other Service:

Retained by LECA:

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

The CO has alleged that the RO's behaved in an unprofessional manner, were rude and defamatory. The RO's were investigating an ongoing neighbor dispute / mischief that had been ongoing for months resulting in 25 calls for service in 2024. The CO does not live at the residence and their connection there was unestablished.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Public-Uncivil - Sec 12 CPSA Reg. 407/28 – Unsubstantiated

Decision and Reasons

There had been a total of 25 calls for service that the [REDACTED] have attended in 2024 involving and the home owner and several of his immediate neighbors. The area in which they reside is rural farm properties with hundreds of acres of land. The neighbors have called by-law, had meetings with the town as well as meetings with the police in attempts to find resolution. It is evident that the home owner, for whatever his reason, has disregarded the wellbeing and enjoyment of his neighbour's property and quality of life.

Police officers are required to keep the peace and the public safe. In this situation, officers had already been to the location earlier in the evening, spoke with several witnesses and collected evidence. Police attended and spoke with the home owner and warned him about his behavior. As officers were called back to the area, they needed to act and make the home owner aware that he would be charged at a later date as he had already been warned. The home owner was subsequently arrested on [REDACTED] after several additional similar calls for service and those charges are still before the courts.

The CO does not live at that residence, it is unknown if the CO is familiar with all the details surrounding the lengthy history between the home owner and the neighbours. When asked, the CO would not disclose their connection to the residence or the home owner. Body worn camera footage was reviewed at length. The RO's showed patience and restraint while dealing with the CO and the home owner. Based on the totality of the evidence reviewed, there are no grounds for misconduct by either of the RO's.