

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: 12/31/2024

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 the Respondent Officer failed to conduct a thorough and impartial investigation, while showing a significant bias into an assault complaint on or about July 3, 2024.

The Complainant stated that the Respondent Officer dismissed evidence (video and photographic), did not take the call seriously, and decided not to proceed with criminal charges despite the abundance of evidence available.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Neglects to do Duty - O'Reg. 407/23 Section 19 contrary to the CSPA

Decision and Reasons

There was no clear and convincing evidence presented by the Complainant to substantiate the allegation of Neglects to do Duty. Witness interviews and available evidence was reviewed. There were inconsistencies and differing information provided by those involved. The Complainant did not provide any video evidence that was in their possession which would have helped to corroborate or refute the information. The Complainant did not wish to participate in the investigation. As a result, the Professional Standards Investigator was left to analyse the information that was available.

It was determined that the Respondent Officer completed all the steps required while investigating the assault complaint, including interviews with all parties involved and reviewing all video and still images available. There was no evidence provided that would show that the Respondent Officer neglected their duty, erred in their decision making or showed a bias towards any of those involved.

Further to this, it was learned that the Respondent Officer responded to the call for services well within the time frame outlined in the [REDACTED] Policy and Procedures and that the investigation was completed in a timely manner.

Given the reasons above, it has been determined that allegation of Neglects to do Duty is unsubstantiated.