

Decision Regarding Findings Report INV-24-39 Concerning Policing Provided by the Niagara Regional Police Service

Decision By:

Ryan Teschner, Inspector General of Policing

I. INTRODUCTION

- [1] This decision addresses a complaint received by the Inspector General of Policing against the Niagara Regional Police Service (“NRPS”), alleging that the NRPS failed to respond to a call for service relating to a noise complaint. An inspector with Ontario’s Inspectorate of Policing (“IoP”) investigated the complaint to determine whether the NRPS failed to comply with the *Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019*, SO 2019, c 1, Sch 1 (the “Act”) or its regulations.
- [2] Following a review of the inspector’s Findings Report,¹ which is attached to this Decision as Appendix A, and for the reasons that follow, I conclude that the NRPS has complied with the Act and the regulations.

II. BACKGROUND

- [3] The complainant stated that he and two other individuals contacted the NRPS by making a 911 call on June 13, 2024 to complain about a noise disturbance as well as a person operating a motorised vehicle without a license. As the disturbance nearby continued, he called 911 again. This time, he was told that the police had already attended and the matter was closed. The complainant insisted that the police never attended and that the call-taker refused to provide a report number.
- [4] The IoP inspector confirmed that the NRPS received a 911 call at 6:27 p.m. on June 13, 2024 regarding a van across the street playing loud, vulgar music with children around. As well, an individual who was purportedly on a probation order was allegedly operating a motor vehicle without a license.
- [5] The police dispatch records revealed that the 911 caller was not the complainant but a different individual, and that the caller provided the wrong address leading to a minor delay in response time. The call was assigned a priority 4, which describes a low-risk call for service.
- [6] At 6:38 p.m., a police officer arrived at the scene. The officer spoke with several neighbours outside who claimed to have seen nothing unusual. The officers heard no noise, and at 6:42 p.m. cleared the call.

¹ Section 123 of the Act requires an IoP inspector who completes an investigation of a complaint to report their findings to the Inspector General. This report is redacted to comply with the *Publication of Findings Reports and Directions under Sections 123 and 125 of the Act Regulation*, O Reg 317/24.

[7] Several more calls to 911 followed an hour later by individuals other than the complainant, insisting that no police had attended. Further officers were dispatched at 10:43 p.m. but found no noise and no disturbance. The subsequent calls were also cleared.

[8] On June 13, 2024, there were five officers and one sergeant on duty in the patrol area. Any delays in police response were attributable to the need to respond to higher priority calls (that often required two or more officers) during this time period. At the time of the second NRPS response to this incident, there were nine other calls for service in the queue. Predictably, lower priority calls were queued until officers were available.

III. ISSUES

[9] The complaint raises only one issue that I must address: did the NRPS provide “adequate and effective policing”, as defined by the Act?

IV. ANALYSIS

[10] Section 11 of the Act describes the requirements for “adequate and effective” policing:

11 (1) Adequate and effective policing means all of the following functions provided in accordance with the standards set out in the regulations, including the standards with respect to the avoidance of conflicts of interest, and with the requirements of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the Human Rights Code:

1. Crime prevention.
2. Law enforcement.
3. Maintaining the public peace.
4. Emergency response.
5. Assistance to victims of crime.
6. Any other prescribed policing functions.

(2) Adequate and effective policing does not include,

- (a) the enforcement of municipal or First Nation by-laws, other than prescribed by-laws; and
- (b) providing court security in accordance with Part XV.

[emphasis added]

[11] These standards are further informed by the *Adequate and Effective Policing (General)* Regulation, O Reg 392/23, which requires:

15. (1) For the purposes of paragraph 6 of subsection 11 (1) of the Act, adequate and effective policing includes dispatching members of a police service.

(2) The following standards for adequate and effective policing, relating to the dispatching of members of a police service, are prescribed:

1. A communications centre that operates 24 hours a day with one or more communications operators or dispatchers to answer emergency calls for service and that maintains constant two-way voice communication capability with police officers who are on patrol or responding to emergency calls must be used for the purposes of dispatching members of a police service.

2. A member of a police service must be available 24 hours a day to supervise police communications and dispatch services.

3. Police officers on patrol must be provided with portable two-way voice communication capability that allows the police officers to be in contact with the communications centre when away from their vehicle or on foot patrol.

4. A member of a police service who supervises communications operators and dispatchers must have successfully completed the training prescribed by the Minister on that subject.

(3) Every chief of police shall establish written procedures on communications and dispatch services.

[12] Based on the Findings Report, I am satisfied that there were no provisions of the Act that were violated by the NRPS, nor any aspect of the “adequate and effective” Regulation that was not complied with.

[13] The NRPS had and utilised the required call-taking and dispatching functions. It also provided an emergency response based on a prioritisation that was objectively reasonable and in accordance with the established NRPS policies. The NRPS engaged in an appropriate response relative to the risk that was assessed, the resources that were available and the need to provide a more immediate response to other, higher-priority calls that represented a greater threat to public safety.

[14] Moreover, I commend the NRPS for its approach to ‘customer service’ in this matter. The NRPS call-taker independently confirmed whether officers had attended the first call for service, and tried to contact the caller to provide this information back to them. Taking these steps, where resources and circumstances allow, to provide those that call 911 with information about the status and/or outcome of their call for service is transparent and can serve to enhance public confidence in policing.

V. CONCLUSION

[15] The NRPS provided “adequate and effective” policing in relation to the call for service.

Date: December 30, 2025

Original Signed By

Ryan Teschner
Inspector General of Policing

FINDINGS REPORT

Niagara Regional Police Service

**Section 107(1)(a) Policing
Complaint Investigation**
(INV-24-39)

Submitted to:
Ryan Teschner
Inspector General of Policing of
Ontario

September 2, 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABOUT THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICING AND THE INSPECTORATE OF POLICING	3
INTRODUCTION.....	3
OVERVIEW OF INVESTIGATION	4
The Complaint	4
The Subject Police Service.....	4
Applicable Legislative and Regulatory Provisions	4
SUMMARY OF THE INVESTIGATION CONDUCTED	5
Complainant Interview	5
Niagara Regional Police Service Records and Procedures	6
INVESTIGATION FINDINGS	8

ABOUT THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICING AND THE INSPECTORATE OF POLICING

The Inspector General of Policing drives improved performance and accountability in policing and police governance by overseeing the delivery of adequate and effective policing across Ontario. The Inspector General ensures compliance with the province's policing legislation and standards, and has the authority to issue progressive, risk-based and binding directions and measures to protect public safety. Ontario's Community Safety and Policing Act embeds protections to ensure the Inspector General's statutory duty is delivered independently from government.

The Inspector General of Policing leads the Inspectorate of Policing (IoP). The IoP provides operational support to inspect, investigate, monitor, and advise Ontario's police services, boards and special constable employers. By leveraging independent research and data intelligence, the IoP promotes leading practices and identifies areas for improvement, ensuring that high-quality policing and police governance is delivered to make everyone in Ontario safer.

In March 2023, Ryan Teschner was appointed as Ontario's first Inspector General of Policing with duties and authorities under the Community Safety and Policing Act. Mr. Teschner is a recognized expert in public administration, policing and police governance.

For more information about the Inspector General of Policing or the IoP, please visit www.iopontario.ca.

INTRODUCTION

This is a report to the Inspector General of Policing by an inspector appointed by the Inspector General, who has completed an inspection under Part VII of the *Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019* (CSPA).

OVERVIEW OF INVESTIGATION

The Complaint

A written complaint was forwarded by the Law Enforcement Complaints Agency (LECA) to the Inspector General of Policing under the provisions of section 108 of the CSPA. It was alleged that the Niagara Regional Police Service (NRPS) failed to provide adequate and effective policing by refusing to respond to a call made on June 13, 2024, relating to a noise complaint. Additionally, dispatch refused to send officers and provide the caller with a report number.

The Subject Police Service

Name of Police Service: Niagara Regional Police Service

Service Headquarters: 5700 Valley Way, Niagara Falls, ON L2E 1X8

Chief of Police: Bill Fordy

Chief of Police since February 2024

Service Total Strength: (Actual & Authorized)

- **Number of sworn members:**
Actual: 842
Authorized: 819
- **Number of civilian members:**
Actual: 343
Authorized: 348

Geographic Service Area

- Total area covered: Approximately 1850 square kilometres
- Population served: Approximately 539,180

Applicable Legislative and Regulatory Provisions

[Section 11\(1\)](#) of the CSPA provides that adequate and effective policing means all of the following functions provided in accordance with the standards set out in the regulations, including the standards with respect to the avoidance of conflicts of interest, and with the requirements of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* and the *Human Rights Code*:

1. Crime prevention.
2. Law enforcement.
3. Maintaining the public peace.
4. Emergency response.
5. Assistance to victims of crime.
6. Any other prescribed policing functions.

The following regulation was reviewed having regard to the allegations made in the complaint:

[Ontario Regulation 392/23: Adequate and Effective Policing \(General\)](#)

SUMMARY OF THE INVESTIGATION CONDUCTED

Complainant Interview

The complainant submitted a complaint to LECA alleging that he contacted police regarding a noise disturbance and an individual operating a motorized vehicle without a licence. He stated that multiple calls were made and that they were advised police had attended and the matter was closed. However, the complainant reported that the disruptive behaviour continued, prompting another 911 call. He alleged that police refused to provide a report number or respond further, citing the case as already closed. He also claimed the call taker declined to dispatch officers, refused to provide a report number, and terminated the call.

An interview was conducted with the complainant. He confirmed that he contacted the NRPS 911 on June 13, 2024, and in the days that followed regarding the incident. He stated that he made multiple follow-up calls but was disconnected without receiving any information. The complainant further explained that dispatch advised him to contact the non-emergency line; however, when he did so, his request to speak with a sergeant was denied. He reported spending the day outside with his friends and stated that police never attended the scene. The complainant also mentioned that he was provided with a report number at the time but, due to the passage of time, no longer has access to it.

The complainant stated that he was unable to identify the two other individuals who also called 911 on June 13, 2024. In his initial complaint, he indicated that he had video footage of the incident and had spoken with a sergeant. However, during the interview, he explained that he no longer possesses the video footage due to switching service providers and could not recall the name of the sergeant he spoke with. He also noted that he no longer has access to his cellphone call history for the same reason. The complainant confirmed that he did not contact a supervisor or the Professional Standards Unit of the NRPS to address his concerns.

Niagara Regional Police Service Records and Procedures

After completing a thorough review of the information provided by the NRPS, the following information was discovered.

On June 13, 2024, a call was made to 911 at 6:27 p.m. regarding a van across the street playing loud vulgar music with children around and that an individual was driving a motorized vehicle without a license. The complainant also mentioned that the individual was on a probation order.

A review of the Computer Aid Dispatch (CAD) revealed that the 911 calls were made by different individuals, not the complainant. Additionally, the call taker noted that the officers were sent to the wrong address in a different city, which caused delays. The call was classified as a priority 4 by the call taker.

At 6:38 p.m., the CAD revealed that officers attended the matter and that a few neighbours were outside, and they indicated that they never saw anything. Additionally, no noise was heard when the officers attended the matter, and they indicated that no other unit was required. At 6:42 p.m., the call was cleared by the officer.

A second call was made to 911 at 7:38 p.m., by the same individual indicating that the officer did not attend despite being informed that “they did put through to a sergeant as requested.”

A review of a second CAD revealed that a call was made to 911 at 7:43 p.m. by a third party who was not on scene regarding a noise complaint.

The CAD revealed that at 7:43 p.m., that the individual informed the call taker that they had called earlier but no officers attended. At 9:51 p.m., a review was completed, and the call taker attempted to call the individual, but the voicemail indicated a different person’s name.

At 10:43 p.m., officers were dispatched, and the matter was cleared.

The NRPS Professional Standard Unit indicated that due to higher priority calls, no officer and sergeant was able to attend until 10:43 p.m. The call was deemed a priority 4. It was indicated that other calls at the time required two units and were higher priority which caused delays to lower priority calls.

Furthermore, the NRPS Professional Standard Unit, confirmed that no calls were made by the complainant on June 13, 2024. They confirmed that the complainant called on

June 5, 20, 25 and 26 for matters unrelated to the allegations. The complainant called the police service in 2024 over 19 times.

The NRPS General Order-033.11 effective June 17, 2022, was reviewed. The document outlines the criteria to determine the priority of a call, definitions of type of calls, goals, and objectives for each priority.

As the complainant's call was categorized as a priority 4, the call response protocol for priority 4 calls was reviewed. The definition for a priority 4 is, *low risk were property crimes – just occurred*, no violence or threat of violence, past event** with a suspect and requires a mobile response. *Just occurred = 5-20 minutes **Past Event = >20 minutes.*

When generating calls for service, communicators on the Police Priority Dispatch System shall assign response priorities as follows:

- (a) Priority 1 – Urgent;
- (b) Priority 2 – High Risk;
- (c) Priority 3 – Moderate Risk;
- (d) Priority 4 – Low Risk;
- (e) Priority 5 – Minimal / No Risk; and
- (f) Priority 6 – Informational / Referral.

The general order document indicated that priority 4 calls will be dispatched as soon as possible and, in any event, will not be held in anticipation of the receipt of greater priority calls. Communicators will notify a patrol supervisor of Priority 3 and Priority 4 calls that have been waiting for a minimum of sixty (60) minutes.

The queued calls in pending for June 13, 2024, was reviewed. At the time of the complainant's call, there were 9 calls in queue. There were five officers on duty for the area, plus a sergeant. Additionally, if a higher priority call came in after the complainant's call, that would further delay the response to the priority 4.

The sergeant from the Professional Standard Unit stated that the NRPS CAD system does not have an option for generating a report that will provide a snapshot period of time to capture the calls waiting, active incidents and available officers. The sergeant explained that, following a review of the GPS [Global Positioning System] Replay and Incident Histories from the time the call was received to when it was dispatched on June 13, 2024, it was determined that most of the calls in queued or in progress required the deployment of 2 units.

INVESTIGATION FINDINGS

I make the following findings, relying on the material and information collected during the investigation and now contained in this report:

1. The NRPS received a call regarding a noise complaint and an individual driving a motorized vehicle without a license.

- a. On June 13, 2024, at 6:27 p.m., a call was made to 911 by an individual.
- b. The call was not made by the complainant associated with this investigation.
- c. At 6:38 p.m., the CAD transcript revealed that the officers attended the matter and spoke with neighbors.
- d. No noise was heard when the officers attended the matter, and they indicated that no other unit was required.

2. The NRPS received a second call regarding a noise complaint and an individual driving a motorized vehicle without a license.

- a) On June 13, 2024, at 7:38 p.m., a call was made to 911 by an individual who indicated that officers did not attend.
- b) The call was made by an individual who was not on scene.
- c) The call was deemed a priority 4.
- d) At 9:51 p.m., a review was completed, and the call taker attempted to call the individual, but the voicemail indicated a different person's name.
- e) At 10:43 p.m., officers were dispatched, and the matter was cleared.
- f) Due to higher priority calls, no officer and sergeant were able to attend until 10:43 p.m.

3. Additional details about the June 13, 2024, incident was provided by both the NRPS Professional Standard Unit and the complainant.

- a) The Professional Standard Unit confirmed that no calls were made by the complainant on June 13, 2024.
- b) The Professional Standard Unit confirmed that the complainant called on June 5, 20, 25 and 26 for matters unrelated to the allegations.

777 Bay Street, 7th Floor
Toronto, ON M5G 2C8
Tel: +1-416-873-5930 or 1-888-333-5078
www.iopontario.ca

Improving policing performance to make
everyone in Ontario safer.

Ce rapport est aussi disponible en français