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: 11/04/2024

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service: ◉ Referred to Other Service: ○ Retained by LECA: ○

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint
Complainant alleges the Respondent Officers were uncivil towards him during a Mental Health Act call for service.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Undermines Public Trust Sec. 10(1) CSPA O. Reg 407/28

Decision and Reasons

Complainant had contacted Emergency Communications Centre three times on date of incident. First call-taker could not have the complainant understand that their issue was not a police matter, but due to their state of agitation and anxiety, two officers were dispatched to check on the complainant's well-being.

The second call-taker spent time with the complainant offering resources for Mental Health by directing the complainant to "google 211". The complainant advised there was nothing there to help them.

The Respondent Officers attended and met with the complainant, who was already agitated due to the police response to his address. The two Respondent Officers met the complainant outside and determined there were no grounds to apprehend the complainant under the Mental Health Act. The Respondent Officers offered resources to the complainant to which the complainant declined. Once the Respondent Officers offered resources and there were no grounds for an apprehension, the Respondent Officers disengaged and departed the scene.

The complainant also wanted the first call-taker charged criminally for sending officers to their address.

The actions of the Respondent Officers followed Service policies and guidelines. Also, the allegation of incivility could not be supported; therefore the allegation could not be substantiated.