

Decision Regarding Findings Report INV-24-44 Concerning Policing Provided by the Durham 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 Durham Regional Police Service (“DRPS”), alleging that the DRPS refused to accept a complaint alleging harassment and stalking by a neighbour. Instead, the DRPS purportedly told the complainant that it was a by-law matter that should be addressed through a non-police response.
- [2] An inspector with Ontario’s Inspectorate of Policing (“IoP”) investigated the complaint to determine whether the DRPS failed to comply with the *Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019*, SO 2019, c 1, Sch 1 (the “Act”) or its regulations.
- [3] 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 DRPS has complied with the Act and the regulations.

II. BACKGROUND

- [4] The complainant alleges that he has, for two years, complained to the DRPS about his neighbour’s behaviour. His neighbour purportedly idled his truck outside the complainant’s home; revved the truck’s engine to coincide with the complainant’s movements around his home; and watched the complainant’s home whilst parked in his truck outside. The complainant claims to have made multiple attempts to present video evidence he has taken of the neighbour’s harassment and stalking behaviour to the DRPS, who have refused to accept it and investigate the matter.
- [5] The complainant has refused to contact the local by-law services, as recommended by the DRPS, because he insists that this is not a by-law matter.
- [6] The complainant provided a screenshot of an online, non-emergency complaint that he submitted to DRPS on February 25, 2024. The screenshot describes “a guy sitting in his truck revving his truck” and the complaint that he and his wife cannot sleep because of the noise. DRPS records reveal that a police officer followed up with the complainant, requesting a description of the truck and licence plate number. A link was provided to the complainant to submit the details within 30 days. The complainant failed to provide the information and the link expired. The report was closed by the DRPS due to the lack of response by the complainant.

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] The complainant submitted another online complaint to the DRPS on February 12, 2025, which described the loud revving of a truck engine by the neighbour and that someone was sitting in the neighbour's truck drinking alcohol. The complainant reports that he was told by DRPS that they cannot take any action as the neighbour was on his own property.
- [8] The IoP inspector reviewed the videoclips submitted by the complainant. The Inspector identified noises of a truck (belonging to the neighbour) being started at different times, sometimes coinciding with the complainant's departure from his home. However, there was no noticeable revving of the truck engine, nor any interaction between the complainant and the neighbour, in any of the submitted clips.
- [9] The IoP inspector also reviewed DRPS records concerning the neighbour. Various calls for service were logged in the Computer Assisted Dispatch (CAD), including complaints about noise. In each instance, however, DRPS officers were dispatched and the calls were cleared by the attending officers, with no evidence of noise at any of the times they attended. Three of the six complaints that DRPS received were cleared as "non-reportable", with the attending officers' comments recorded in the CAD report, and no occurrence reports being filed by the officers.
- [10] Finally, DPRS records confirm that following receipt of the last online complaint submitted by the complainant, a "Road Watch" letter was issued by DRPS to the neighbour. It advised the neighbour that a vehicle making unnecessary noise could be a violation of the HTA, and that if the incident was observed by a police officer and resulted in a conviction, it could lead to a fine and possible demerit points. The letter also noted that future incidents may result in contact by a DRPS officer.

III. ISSUES

- [11] The complaint raises only one issue that I must address:

1. Did the DRPS provide "adequate and effective policing", as defined by the Act?

IV. ANALYSIS

[12] 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.

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

9. (1) The following standards for adequate and effective policing, relating primarily to emergency response, are prescribed:

1. Response to emergency calls for service shall be provided, 24 hours a day.
...
3. The members of a police service providing the emergency response ... must be able to be deployed within a reasonable time ...

[14] The complainant submitted at least six complaints, all alleging some form of excessive noise, and in one case, that the neighbour was drinking in his truck. In each instance, officers attended at the neighbour’s residence and satisfied themselves that there was no noise or disturbance meriting further investigation or action by DRPS. Some of the calls were cleared as “non-reportable” with no

attendant occurrence report, although the officers' observations were logged in the CAD log. Overall, the DRPS provided an adequate response.

[15] Although the complainant believes that he is being harassed, the IoP investigation failed to reveal any information to support this perspective, or suggest that DRPS should have approached the complaints by way of a criminal investigation. At their core, the complaints received by DRPS allege only noise and, in one instance, that an individual is drinking in their vehicle.

[16] Moreover, the DRPS sent formal correspondence to the neighbour (*i.e.*, the "Road Watch" letter) that identified the possibility that revving a vehicle may be an HTA offence, and that further complaints could result in more action by DRPS. I commend this as a useful response that strikes the appropriate balance between the value of some formal engagement by DRPS, without utilizing policing human resources that are better directed at other matters that merit a public safety response.

[17] Finally, there was also at least on one occasion on which the complainant was given the opportunity to provide more information to DRPS, but chose not to do so. The consequence flowing from that decision does not lie at the feet of DRPS. The complainant was given the opportunity and elected not to avail himself of it.

[18] Nonetheless, the DRPS complied with the applicable CSPA requirements, including the "Emergency Response" requirements of the A&E Regulation (subsection 9(1)1: *response to emergency calls for service shall be provided 24 hours a day*; subsection 9(1)3: *response must be provided in a reasonable time.*)

V. CONCLUSION

1. Based on the investigation, I am satisfied that there were no provisions of the Act that were violated by the DRPS, nor any aspect of the "adequate and effective" regulation that was not complied with.
2. No further action is required.

Date: December 17, 2025

Original Signed By

Ryan Teschner
Inspector General of Policing

FINDINGS REPORT

Durham Regional Police Service

**Section 107(1)(a) Policing
Complaint Investigation**
(INV-24-44)

Submitted to:
Ryan Teschner
Inspector General of Policing of
Ontario

23 October, 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
Information from the Complainant.....	5
Durham Regional Police Service Records	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 investigation under Part VII of the [Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019](#) (CSPA).

OVERVIEW OF INVESTIGATION

The Complaint

The Inspectorate of Policing received a complaint via a referral from the Law Enforcement Complaints Agency (LECA). This complaint was in relation to an incident on May 10, 2024, when the complainant attended a Durham Regional Police Service (DRPS) station to report concerns about his neighbour. He alleges that the DRPS refused to sit down and allow him to submit video footage in support of his complaint. He was informed the matter was considered a by-law issue.

The complainant further states that the neighbour has been stalking him for the past two years, and that despite multiple calls to police regarding ongoing harassment, no response has been received.

The Subject Police Service

Name of Police Service: Durham Regional Police Service

Service Headquarters: 605 Rossland Road East, Whitby, ON. L1N 0B8

Chief of Police: Peter Moreira

Chief of Police since March 2023

Service Total Strength: (Actual & Authorized)

- Number of sworn members
Actual: 1066
Authorized: 1147
- Number of civilian members
Actual: 335.5
Authorized: 409

Geographic Service Area

- 2535 Square Kilometers
- Community Population of approximately 792, 615

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.

Ontario Regulation 392/23: ADEQUATE AND EFFECTIVE POLICING (GENERAL)

was reviewed having regard to the allegations made in the complaint.

SUMMARY OF THE INVESTIGATION CONDUCTED

Information from the Complainant

The complainant alleges that for the past two years, his neighbour has deliberately started and idled his truck throughout the day as a form of intimidation and harassment. He claims the neighbour often sits in the vehicle from sunup to sundown watching his house and mimicking his movements by starting the truck and revving the engine whenever he moves inside. The complainant states that he and his family feel they are being watched constantly. He further alleges that the engine is revved for hours at a time, preventing them from enjoying their property and causing them to feel fearful.

To document the behaviour, the complainant advised that he purchased camera equipment and has compiled notes and videos. He describes a pattern in which, every time he steps outside his house, the truck starts up and the door is left open, contributing to the feeling of being watched. He has retained both notes and video evidence of this alleged harassment.

The complainant submitted five short video clips from his home security camera, dated between December 4, 2024, to January 16, 2025. The videos range from 37 to 53 seconds in length and capture the sound of a truck being started; however, the engine is not revved, and the vehicle does not leave the driveway. In three of the videos, a neighbour across the street is seen opening the truck door, closing it, and starting the vehicle during the early morning hours, while the complainant is not visible. The remaining two clips, recorded later in the day, show the complainant either arriving at or leaving his residence, during which the sound of a truck engine starting can be heard. In these instances, the neighbour is not visible, and there is no interaction between the complainant and the neighbour.

The complainant reported multiple attempts to seek police assistance regarding his ongoing concerns. He claims that he was told by DRPS that they could not take action, as the individual was on his own property.

On January 9, 2024, his wife contacted the non-emergency line after the neighbour allegedly revved a truck engine for 20 minutes. On February 25, 2024, he submitted an online complaint and provided a screenshot of the submission, in which he describes the incident as “a guy sits in his truck revving his truck” adding that he has made several complaints and that he and his wife were unable to sleep due to the nightly disturbances. He also contacted the DRPS on March 17, 2024, although no further details were provided. On May 10, 2024, he attended the police station in person to file a complaint, but staff reportedly declined to accept the evidence he brought. On December 20, 2024, he was advised at the front desk that the police would not take a complaint related to stalking and harassment.

He reiterated that he possesses substantial evidence of the stalking and harassment.

The complainant reported that he submitted another online report on Feb 12, 2025, describing loud revving of a black F-150 truck at 7:44 p.m. and alleging that the individual was drinking inside of the vehicle, posing a potential danger to the community. He noted that this report was approved by DRPS.

The complainant stated that he has not contacted by-law services, asserting that the issue is not a by-law matter, but rather one of stalking and harassment. He also advised that similar behaviour was occurring at his workplace from a coworker.

The complainant has expressed ongoing frustration regarding his attempts to report what he perceives as stalking and harassment by a neighbour. He claims to have made multiple efforts to meet with DRPS to present video evidence, which he believes support his allegations. He indicated that this behaviour has been ongoing for several years and is also occurring at his workplace. Despite submitting an online report in February 2025, the complainant states that no action has been taken. He continues to express a strong desire to provide video evidence of the alleged stalking and harassment and to have the matter be formally investigated as such.

Durham Regional Police Service Records

On February 25, 2024, the complainant submitted an online report. On February 26, 2024, an officer responded to the complainant, requesting a description of the truck and a license plate number. The complainant was provided with a link to submit the requested information and advised that the link would expire after 30 days. As no response was received within that timeframe, the report was closed due to the lack of follow-up from the complainant.

A search of DRPS local database for the neighbour's address, found the following calls for service.

On January 9, 2024, at 11:15 p.m., a noise complaint was received. The Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) indicated a vehicle in the driveway was making excessive noise, revving its engine for 45 minutes. The complainant was listed as anonymous. A cruiser was dispatched to the area, but upon arrival, no noise was heard. The call was cleared at 12:35 a.m. with the CAD remarks - nothing heard. No general occurrence report was filed for this incident.

On March 17, 2024, at 10:27 p.m., a call was received regarding loud music at the neighbour's address. The complainant provided his first name and phone number but refused to provide his surname. Officers were dispatched, and the call was cleared at 10:54 p.m. No further comments were added to the CAD, and no general occurrence report was filed.

On March 24, 2024, at 10:55 p.m., the complainant called to report a noise complaint at the neighbour's address, stating that there was loud music and revving of a truck. Officers were dispatched, and at 11:55 p.m., the CAD noted that the residence was in darkness, and all was quiet. No general occurrence report was filed for this incident.

Since the original request for information dated January 15, 2025, the following information was obtained.

On February 12, 2025, the complainant filed a noise complaint through the online reporting portal, reporting loud revving of a black F150 and a male drinking inside the truck, suggesting a potential danger to the community. A report was generated but subsequently closed due to insufficient evidence to proceed.

On February 14, 2025, the complainant submitted another noise complaint via the online portal, stating that a black truck was revving its engine for hours, waking up the kids in the morning. A Road Watch letter was sent by DRPS to the suspect associated with the noise complaint. The letter indicated that a complaint was received regarding a vehicle making unnecessary noise as per section 75(4) of the *Highway Traffic Act*. It stated that had this incident been observed by a police officer, fines and possibly demerit points could apply. Further reported incidents may result in personal contact by a police officer.

INVESTIGATION FINDINGS

I make the following findings, relying on the information collected during the investigation and summarized in part above:

1. The complainant believes that for the last two years, a neighbour has been deliberately harassing and stalking him by frequently starting, idling, and revving his truck throughout the day.

- a. Through multiple correspondences with the complainant, he feels that the neighbour is watching his house and monitors his movements. He reports that the truck is started or revved in direct response to his actions – specifically, whenever he moves inside his home or steps outside. The complainant describes a consistent and repetitive pattern in which the truck starts up and the truck door is left open each time he exits his house. This behaviour has contributed to an ongoing feeling of being watched.
- b. The complainant advised that, in response to this ongoing behaviour, he purchased and installed video cameras to document the incidents. He has recorded multiple video clips which he believes clearly demonstrate a targeted and intentional pattern of behaviour by the neighbour.
- c. A review of five video clips submitted by the complainant captures the sound of a truck being started in the early morning and the later part of the day. The complainant feels these clips show that these activities are not random but rather deliberate and repeated.

2. The complainant has submitted multiple noise complaints regarding his neighbour to the DRPS. These complaints have been made via phone calls and online reporting.

- a. Jan 9, 2024: A call was received about a vehicle revving its engine for 45 minutes. No complainant information was provided. Officers attended but found no disturbance. The call was cleared via CAD entry noting, “nothing heard.”
- b. Feb 25–26, 2024: An online complaint was submitted regarding a neighbour revving his truck, an officer followed up, requesting a vehicle description and plate number via a secure link. The complainant did not respond within the 30-day window, and the report was closed due to lack of follow-up.

- c. Mar 17, 2024: A call was made reporting loud music. The complainant provided a first name and phone number but declined to give a surname. Officers were dispatched; and the call was cleared via CAD entry with no further comments recorded.
- d. Mar 24, 2024: Another call was received regarding loud music and engine revving. Officers attended and observed the residence to be dark and quiet. The call was cleared via CAD entry.
- e. Feb 12, 2025: An online report alleged loud revving from a black Ford F-150 and a male drinking inside the vehicle, raising safety concerns. A report was generated but closed due to insufficient evidence.
- f. Feb 14, 2025: A follow-up complaint reported prolonged engine revving disturbing children's sleep. A Road Watch letter was issued by DRPS to the individual associated with the vehicle.

3. The complainant is frustrated that the DRPS has not accepted his video evidence and allowed him to file a stalking and harassment report.

- a. He reported that on at least two occasions, May 10, and December 20, 2024, he attended the police station to present the video evidence of the alleged harassing behaviour. On both occasions, he was informed that DRPS would not take a stalking and or harassment report based on the evidence provided.
- b. On January 16, 2025, the DRPS confirmed that there was no occurrence report or CAD information on file regarding the complainant and any neighbour trouble or stalking and harassment.
- c. A subsequent online report submitted in February 2025 regarding an individual drinking in his truck and revving the engine was accepted by the DRPS. Despite this the complainant remains frustrated that the service has not taken formal statements from him or his witnesses or collected his video evidence.
- d. Although the complainant considers the behaviour to be harassment, his reports often describe the conduct in terms such as "revved his truck on high for 20 minutes" or "guy sits in his truck revving his truck."

- e. The complainant has not reported his concerns to municipal by-law, as he believes the issue is not a by-law matter but rather a case of stalking and criminal harassment.

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