

Decision Regarding Findings Report INV-25-01 Concerning the Conduct of Ottawa Police Service Board Member Cathy Curry

Decision By:

Ryan Teschner, Inspector General of Policing

I. INTRODUCTION

- [1] This decision addresses an allegation that Cathy Curry, a member of the Ottawa Police Service Board (“OPSB”), committed misconduct by ignoring or refusing to address the complainant’s concerns without providing a reasonable explanation. This allegation was investigated by an inspector with Ontario’s Inspectorate of Policing (“IoP”) who prepared a Findings Report,¹ which is attached to this Decision as Appendix A.
- [2] Following a review of the Findings Report and for the reasons that follow, I conclude that Ms. Curry has not committed misconduct in contravention of subsections 3(1) nor subsection 10(1) of the *Code of Conduct for Police Service Board Members Regulation*, O Reg 408/23 (“Code of Conduct”), enacted under the *Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019*, SO 2019, c 1, Sch 1 (the “Act”). In fact, it is my view that Ms. Curry handled the inquiries and requests from the complainant professionally, and in a manner that rightfully distinguishes between the role of a police service board member, professional board staff, and the chief of police.

II. BACKGROUND

- [3] Ms. Curry is a councilor on the Ottawa City Council and a member of the OPSB. She was appointed to the OPSB by a resolution of the City Council in 2022 for a four-year term.
- [4] The complainant first contacted Ms. Curry in June 2024 by email to her Ottawa City Council email address, alleging “civil crimes performed here and criminal code violations performed by the Ottawa police”. Ms. Curry replied to the complainant, suggesting that if the complainant believed that “there are crimes taking place, you must call the police. I, in my role on the OPS Board, deal with governance, policy and budget issues and cannot become involved in police operations.” She also provided the complainant with the telephone number to make a complaint directly to the Ottawa Police Service.
- [5] The complainant continued to email Ms. Curry, who started forwarding the complainant’s emails to the Executive Director of the OPSB. The Board’s Executive Director replied to several of the complainant’s emails, providing general information about how to file complaints with Ontario’s police oversight bodies.

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.

[6] In total, the IoP inspector was provided with 43 email exchanges between Ms. Curry, the Board's Executive Director and the complainant.

III. ISSUES

[7] The single issue is whether Ms. Curry's responses to the complainant's emails fell below an acceptable threshold and so constituted misconduct.

IV. ANALYSIS

[8] After a consideration of the facts and the applicable law, I find, on a balance of probabilities, that Ms. Curry did not commit misconduct.

[9] The pertinent sections of the Code of Conduct include subsection 3(1), which requires:

3. (1) A member of a police service board shall not conduct themselves in a manner that undermines or is likely to undermine the public's trust in the police service board or the police service maintained by the police service board.

Similarly, subsection 10(1) of the Code of Conduct requires that:

10. (1) A member of a police service board shall conduct themselves in a professional and respectful manner in the course of their duties including, without limitation, not using abusive or insulting language in the course of their duties.

[10] Here, Ms. Curry replied to the complainant on the same day with an email that was professional and courteous in tone and responsive in content. What followed might fairly be described as a deluge of emails with additional complaints relating to the OPS, freedom of information, and various other matters.

[11] Ms. Curry, and later the Board's Executive Director, properly explained to the complainant that the role of the Board and its members was not to investigate public complaints concerning the OPS. They provided the complainant with the appropriate information and contact details to make a proper complaint to one of Ontario's police oversight bodies, should the complainant wish to do so.

[12] Ms. Curry demonstrated an understanding of the issues that could arise if the Board, or a board member, became improperly involved in allegations that could lead to a criminal investigation or to a policing complaint.

[13] The subsequent series of actions taken by Ms. Curry in responding to the complainant were commendable. She first responded by explaining the limits of her position as a Board member and followed by describing the available avenues to which the complainant could direct their concerns. Ms. Curry also properly requested the Board's Executive Director to engage the complainant and ensure any necessary follow-up actions were taken.

[14] In short, the process followed by Ms. Curry and the Board's Executive Director was appropriate; it respected the different roles of the Board member, the professional OPSB staff and the chief of police, while still providing timely, responsive replies to the complainant.

V. CONCLUSION

[15] Ms. Curry did not commit misconduct as defined in the Code of Conduct.

Date: March 12, 2026

Original Signed By

Ryan Teschner
Inspector General of Policing

FINDINGS REPORT

Ottawa Police Service Board Member:
Cathy Curry

**Section 106(1) Board Member
Conduct Investigation**
(INV- 25 -1)

Submitted to:
Ryan Teschner
Inspector General of Policing of
Ontario

November 7, 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABOUT THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICING AND THE INSPECTORATE OF POLICING	3
INTRODUCTION	4
OVERVIEW OF INVESTIGATION	4
The Complaint	4
The Subject Police Service Board Member	4
Applicable Legislative and Regulatory Provisions	4
SUMMARY OF THE INVESTIGATION CONDUCTED	5
Complainant Interview	5
Witness Interview	6
Subject Police Service Board Member Interview	7
Additional Material Collected and Reviewed	7
INVESTIGATION FINDINGS	10

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.ioontario.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

A written complaint was received by the Inspector General of Policing alleging that a board member of the Ottawa Police Service Board (OPSB), Cathy Curry, contravened the Code of Conduct for Police Service Board Members. It was alleged that Ms. Curry ignored or refused to address the complainant's concerns without providing a reasonable explanation. Ms. Curry allegedly promised the complainant that she would assist by reviewing his case involving the Ottawa Police Service and by providing guidance on whether a wellness check was legal; however, he reports that she has since refused to provide the necessary support.

The Subject Police Service Board Member

Name of Police Service Board: Ottawa Police Service Board

Subject Board Member: Cathy Curry

Length of Service (Term): Appointed 2022-2026.

Previous Terms on Police Service Board: None

Specific Roles Held on Police Service Board: Board Member

Previous Substantiated Conduct: None

Appointing Authority: Ottawa City Council

Applicable Legislative and Regulatory Provisions

[Section 35\(6\)](#) of the CSPA provides that every member of a police service board shall comply with the prescribed code of conduct.

[Ontario Regulation 408/23: Code of Conduct for Police Service Board Members](#) was reviewed having regard to the allegations made in the complaint and the following sections were deemed to be relevant:

- a) Section 3(1): A member of a police service board shall not conduct themselves in a manner that undermines or is likely to undermine the public's trust in the police service board or the police service maintained by the board; and

- b) Section 10: Board members must conduct themselves professionally and respectfully, avoiding abusive or insulting language.

SUMMARY OF THE INVESTIGATION CONDUCTED

As part of the investigation process, interviews were conducted with the complainant, a witness and the subject OPSB member. Additionally, material forming the basis of the complaint was gathered and reviewed, along with material provided by the subject OPSB member during their interviews.

Steps were taken to determine the origin of the alleged statement. The complainant and the subject OPSB member provided emails that were shared between them since June 2024.

Complainant Interview

An interview was conducted with the complainant.

In June 2024, the complainant sent an email to the subject OPSB member requesting support and guidance regarding a police matter where there was potential police misconduct. The complainant did not allegedly receive any support or information from the subject OPSB member, which led to him submitting the complaint. The complainant mentioned that he had also submitted a complaint with the Law Enforcement Complaints Agency (LECA) and Ontario Human Rights Commission, which were not accepted by either agency. Additionally, the complainant indicated that he had conversations with the Ottawa Police Service Professional Standards Unit (OPS-PSU), and that he was not satisfied with their response. According to the complainant, he requested that communication be completed by telephone because he has difficulties reading and writing, and reports having “mental disabilities”. He stated that the OPSB did not accommodate this request.

During a second interview with the complainant, he explained that he had sent the subject OPSB member supplementary emails requesting a follow-up and was seeking to provide new information regarding an alleged police misconduct. The complainant repeated the allegation that he did not receive any support from the subject OPSB member.

Witness Interview

A written request to obtain further information was sent to the Executive Director (ED) of the OPSB, Habib Sayah, regarding the complaint.

The ED explained that his first encounter with the complainant was in June 2024 at the request of the subject OPSB member. After reviewing the complainant's email, he forwarded the complaint to the Complaints Director at LECA as per Section 155 of the CSPA. It was his opinion that it qualified as a public complaint regarding the misconduct of police officers.

On June 18, 2024, the complaint was forwarded to LECA, and the complainant was informed of their rights under Part X of the CSPA. In addition, the ED indicated that the complaint was also forwarded to the Office of the Chief of Police. A request was made to the office of the Chief of Police to have them respond to the concerns and questions the complainant had asked about the rules governing wellness checks.

On September 27, at the request of the subject OPSB member's city council office, the Board office followed up by email with the Chief's office. At that time, the Board office requested that the Office of the Chief engage with the complainant.

On December 30, the complainant called the Board office and left a voice message. The OPSB Assistant called the complainant back on January 2, 2025, and provided information on how to file a complaint with LECA. The complainant advised that LECA refused to take his complaint because it involved a civilian member. The OPSB Assistant advised the complainant that he could file a complaint regarding the conduct of a civilian member of OPS with the OPS-PSU. The complainant indicated that he was dissatisfied with the service provided by the OPS-PSU. The OPSB Assistant suggested that the complainant could file a policing complaint with the Inspector General of policing and provided him with the Inspectorate's contact details. The complainant stated that he intended to reach out to the OPS-PSU one final time to address his concerns, and that, should he remain unhappy with their response, he would contact the Inspector General.

Subject Police Service Board Member Interview

An interview was completed with the subject OPSB member

She was asked to provide all communication between herself and the complainant. The subject OPSB member explained that when board members receive emails or inquiries related to police activities, or matters that require police involvement, those emails are automatically forwarded to the ED, in accordance with board policy.

The subject OPSB member confirmed that she had never spoken with the complainant by telephone but did reply to some of his emails.

On April 4th, 2025, the subject OPSB member supplied the IoP Inspector with 43 emails between herself, the complainant, and the Executive Director of the OPSB.

Additional Material Collected and Reviewed

Summary of emails from the complainant and subject OPSB member

On June 11, 2024, the complainant sent an email to the subject OPSB member indicating to her that as she is the councillor in Ward 4 – Kanata North:

“You are on the police board, and you must assist me. There are civil crimes performed here and criminal code violations performed by the Ottawa police. I have severe mental disabilities and I am requesting voice communication using the accessible Canada act. Please call me as soon as possible!”.

On June 11, 2024, the subject OPSB member replied to the complainant by email: *“If there are crimes you believe that are taking place, you must call the police. I, in my role on the OPS Board, deal with governance, policy and budget issues and cannot become involved in police operations. I recommend that you call the police. The number is 613-236-1222, extension 7300.”*

On June 12th, 2024, the subject OPSB member then forwarded the email to the ED of the OPSB requesting assistance. The ED indicated that he would verify the information provided by the complainant and determine if it would constitute a complaint to LECA. If it did not meet that threshold, he would forward the information to the Ottawa Police Service.

On July 4, 2024, the complainant sent a lengthy email to the subject OPSB member regarding a police report. On the same day the subject OPSB member forwarded the email to the ED.

On July 12, 2024, the complainant sent another email to the subject OPSB member.

On July 15, 2024, the subject OPSB Member forwarded the email to the ED asking if he could *“maybe find information that might be helpful for him”*.

On July 16, 2024, the ED indicated that he would reach out to the OPS.

On July 18, 2024, the ED replied to the complainant’s email:

“I hope this finds you well. Councillor Curry informed me that you sent her correspondence in relation to the conduct of police officers. Thank you very much for reaching out to the Board with your concerns. While the Ottawa Police Service Board (OPSB) does provide civilian oversight of the Ottawa Police Service, we are not involved in day-to-day operations and investigations. As you may be aware, under the Community Safety and Policing Act (CSPA), 2019, the legislation that governs policing in the province as of April 1st, 2024, the Law Enforcement Complaints Agency (LECA) – formerly known as the Office of the Independent Police Review Director (OIPRD) – is responsible for receiving, managing, and overseeing public complaints about the misconduct of police officers. More information about the role and mandate of LECA can be found [here](#).

If you wish to file a formal complaint with LECA, you may do so by filling the [complaints form available on LECA’s website](#). In keeping with section 155 of the CSPA we will forward your email to the Complaints Director who heads LECA. We will also forward your correspondence to the office of the Chief of Police to ensure that he is aware of your situation. Please let me know if you require further clarification or if you have any further questions.”

On July 23, 2024, the complainant sent another email regarding a Freedom of Information request to the subject OPSB member who forwarded the email to the ED indicating, *“Maybe you can help find the phone number”*. The ED replied he would follow-up.

On September 9, 2024, the complainant sent an email to the subject OPSB member requesting information regarding illegal wellness checks, and the complainant provided the police report number for the alleged unwarranted search.

On November 12, 2024, the complainant sent an email to the subject OPSB member and other members of the OPS regarding a police report.

On December 4, 2024, the complainant sent a lengthy email to the subject OPSB member explaining he was a victim of police brutality.

On December 6, 2024, the complainant sent several emails to the subject OPSB member regarding a missing police report.

On December 6, 2024, the complainant sent an email to Clarke Kelly (Ottawa Ward 5 Councillor), *“Can you help with this one? I carry irrefutable evidence of discrimination where my human rights were deliberately violated by Cathy Curry. I have the evidence on email. Can you help fix these civil crimes performed on me by ward 4?”*

On December 6, 2024, the office of Councillor Clarke Kelly forwarded the email to the subject OPSB member indicating that they were just forwarding the information and taking no action.

On December 18, 2024, the complainant sent an email to the subject OPSB member, *“I need obsb member to acquire information from the police. If you don't serve me, you're doing that because I'm mentally disabled unless you have a legitimate reason for not representing the interest of the public. Communication requested by speech as a result of my mental disabilities.”*

On December 18th, 2024, the subject OPSB member forwarded the email to the ED, *“Can you please give this resident the information he needs to make a complaint, please?”*

On December 29, 2024, the complainant sent an email to the subject OPSB member regarding a civilian at OPS.

On January 1, 2025, the subject OPSB member forwarded the email to the ED, *“Can someone call him to share the information he needs to file a complaint, maybe?”*

On January 2, 2025, the ED responded to the subject OPSB member's email indicating the following: *“We have called [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] to inform him that the appropriate avenue for a complaint regarding the conduct of a civilian member of OPS was the Professional Standards Unit and provided him with their contact information. [Redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] noted that he had already engaged with the PSU and is dissatisfied with their service. We have therefore advised him that he may lodge a service complaint with the Inspectorate of Policing and provided him with information regarding IOP complaints.”*

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 subject OPSB member provided the ED all correspondence she had with the complainant, to ensure it was properly addressed.

- a) On June 11, 2024, the complainant sent an email to the subject OPSB member requesting assistance with a police matter. The subject OPSB member responded to the complainant's email, informing the complainant of her role as a board member. In addition, the subject OPSB member informed the complainant that she could not become involved in day-to-day police operation and provided the OPS number to report crime.
- b) On June 12th, 2024, the subject OPSB member forwarded the email to the ED of the OPSB.
- c) Between July 12th, 2024, and December 29th, 2024, the subject OPSB member forwarded all emails received from the complainant to the ED for follow-ups (July 12, July 23, September 9, November 12, December 4, December 18, December 29, 2024).
- d) On July 18, 2024, the ED sent an email to the complainant explaining the role of the OPSB and that they are not involved in day-to-day operations and investigations. The complainant was also provided with information about the LECA, their mandate, information, and a link to submit a formal complaint regarding police misconduct. In addition, the ED explained to the complainant that due to Section 155 of the CSPA, he would forward his email to the Complaints Director who heads LECA and the Office of the Chief of Police, to ensure that they were aware of the situation.
- e) On January 2, 2025, the OPSB Assistant called the complainant after receiving an email from the complainant. The OPSB Assistant verbally provided the complainant with information on how to file a complaint with LECA.

- f) The complainant responded that LECA refused to take their complaint because it involved a civilian member. The OPSB Assistant followed up with the complainant by telephone, in consideration of their accommodation request, as he claimed that he could not communicate in writing.
- g) The ED stated that the complainant was provided guidance on the course of action available to them including filing a complaint with the Ottawa Police Service Professional Standards Unit (OPS-PSU).
- h) The complainant indicated that he was dissatisfied with the service provided by OPS-PSU. The OPSB Assistant then informed the complainant of the mandate of the Inspector General of Policing and advised that he could file a policing complaint, providing him with the Inspectorate's contact details, which he noted. The complainant stated that he intended to reach out to the OPS-PSU one final time to address his concerns, and that, should he remain dissatisfied with their response, he would contact the Inspector General.

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