

Decision Regarding Findings Report INV-25-15, INV-25-16, & INV-25-17 Concerning Policing Provided by the Niagara Regional Police Service

Decision By:

Ryan Teschner, Inspector General of Policing

I. INTRODUCTION

- [1] Policing resources are finite, and the public depends on police services to deploy them where they will have the greatest impact on public safety while balancing competing demands. That responsibility is shared by the public. Calls to 911 should be reserved for genuine emergencies. When appropriate alternatives exist—such as police non-emergency lines, online reporting, or other service providers—they should be used. By making responsible choices about who to contact, we help ensure that 911 remains available for those in urgent need and that police emergency resources are there when they matter most. In this case, those choices were not made responsibly, and it is important to say so.
- [2] This decision addresses three complaints received by the Inspector General of Policing against the Niagara Regional Police Service (“NRPS”), alleging that the police failed to adequately respond to multiple calls-for-service relating to parking complaints and allegations of threats and harassment. 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.
- [3] The complainant made three separate but related complaints to the IoP in respect of the NRPS. In total, the complainant alleges that the NRPS failed to adequately respond to calls-for-service made on four separate occasions between July and December 2024. As the three complaints raise similar issues, the IoP has addressed them collectively in a single investigation and a single Findings Report.
- [4] 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 NRPS has complied with the Act and the regulations.

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.

II. BACKGROUND

[5] The complainant alleges that the NRPS failed to adequately respond on four occasions:

- i. July 5, 2024: the complainant's father called NRPS regarding a male blocking the driveway and yelling at the complainant;
- ii. October 11, 2024: the complainant called NRPS regarding a car blocking his driveway;
- iii. October 13, 2024: the complainant called NRPS to report that his neighbour's friend had blocked his driveway with a car earlier in the day and given him "the finger"; and
- iv. December 13, 2024: the complainant called NRPS to report that motorcycles and vehicles were parked in front of his driveway.

III. ISSUES

[6] The issue raised in these complaints is whether the NRPS are complying with the Act and its regulations in their responses to the complainant's calls-for-service.

IV. ANALYSIS

[7] I adopt the facts as set out in the Findings Report.

[8] Of the four calls-for-service that are the subject of investigation in this Findings Report, only the one on July 5, 2025 resulted in police attendance. I am satisfied that the NRPS provided adequate and effective policing on that occasion. The call was categorized appropriately based on the information first provided, and police responded in a timely fashion. I note that the computer-assisted dispatch record ("CAD") transcript did not include a complaint alleging any assault.

[9] The remaining three calls-for-service related to neighbour disputes revolving around parking on or blocking of a shared driveway. Parking complaints involving driveways blocked from the street are municipal by-law infractions, which are expressly excluded from the requirements of adequate and effective policing.²

² Subsection 11(2) of the Act reads:

Does not include certain functions

11(2) Adequate and effective policing does not include,

- (a) the enforcement of municipal or First Nation by-laws, other than prescribed by-laws...

Parking complaints involving shared driveways blocked by a neighbour's use of the driveway are typically civil disputes that need not involve police unless criminality is alleged. There are other, more appropriate options to deal with these matters, including contacting municipal by-law enforcement.

[10] I call attention to the 61 documented calls-for-service associated to the complainant's address and the subject-matter of those calls to make a basic but important point: every call-for-service requires the involvement and energies of a call-taker, dispatcher and any police officers who are ultimately dispatched. Where these precious human resources are being occupied by driveway disputes, they are not available for serious community safety matters. All of us have an obligation to keep this front of mind when making the decision to call 911 and seek police assistance.

[11] The complainant is strongly encouraged, instead, to further engage his local municipality or retain private legal counsel to explore the available options to address his private property concerns.

V. CONCLUSION

[12] I find that the NRPS have complied with the Act and its regulations.

Date: July 30, 2026

Original Signed By

Ryan Teschner
Inspector General of Policing

FINDINGS REPORT

Niagara Regional Police Service

**Section 107(1)(a) Policing
Complaint Investigation**
(INV-25-15,16,17)

Submitted to:
Ryan Teschner
Inspector General of Policing of
Ontario

July 16, 2026

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
Niagara Regional Police Service Records.....	5
Niagara Regional Police Service Procedures.....	6
Niagara Regional Police Response.....	7
Complainant Interview	7
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 Inspector General received three separate complaints which all indicated a common element regarding an allegation that the Niagara Regional Police Service (NRPS) refused to respond to calls for service made on July 5, 2024, October 11, 2024, October 13, 2024, and December 13, 2024. The common element relates to allegations of harassment and threatening, as well as parking complaints. The Communications Unit had advised the complainant that parking complaints were not a police matter and were a city by-law issue.

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 1, 2024

Service Total Strength: (Actual & Authorized)

- Sworn – 842 - Actual & 819 - Authorized
- Civilian – 343 - Actual & 348 - Authorized

Geographic Service Area

- 1850 Square Kilometers
- Community Population of 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.

[**Ontario Regulation 392/23: ADEQUATE AND EFFECTIVE POLICING \(GENERAL\)**](#)

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

Ontario Regulation 395/23: INVESTIGATIONS

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

SUMMARY OF THE INVESTIGATION CONDUCTED

Niagara Regional Police Service Records

The Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) records show that the complainant's father contacted NRPS on July 5th, 2024, at 4:44 p.m. This call was categorized as a Disturbance - Priority 3, 911 call regarding a male blocking the driveway and yelling at the complainant. Two police units were dispatched at 4:45 p.m., and officers arrived on scene at 4:52 p.m. The call was cleared at 5:19 p.m. with remarks that a verbal argument took place over a male parked and blocking the complainant's driveway with a vehicle. The clearing remarks further indicated that the parties were separated, there was no criminal offence, and there was no police report taken.

NRPS confirmed that on October 11, 2024, a call from the complainant was received but the call was disconnected by the complainant prior to receiving the complainant's full information required to generate an incident number. The call taker called the complainant back and received information from the complainant that since the vehicle blocking his driveway had left, there did not appear to be a reason for police to attend.

The CAD records for October 13, 2024, indicate that the complainant contacted NRPS at 4:34 p.m. This call was categorized as a Parking Complaint No Dispatch - Priority 6, non-emergency call. The call details indicate that the complainant wanted to report that earlier in the day the neighbour's friend blocked his driveway and gave him the finger. The complainant's driveway was not currently blocked, and the complainant was advised that the police were not coming out for someone giving him the finger. No unit was dispatched, and the complaint was cleared at 4:40 p.m.

The CAD records for December 13, 2024, indicate that the complainant contacted NRPS at 11:24 a.m. This call was categorized as Information - Priority 5. Officers were dispatched at 11:27 a.m., police arrived at 11:41 a.m. and spoke with the complainant. The complaint involved motorcycles in his neighbourhood and vehicles parking in front of his driveway. The complainant provided photos to police which demonstrated that vehicles had obstructed his driveway by a matter of inches. Officers advised the complainant of the limitations police have regarding the motorcycle infractions/issues and directed him to contact by-law regarding parking issues. Officers cleared the call at 1:51 p.m. and a police report was taken.

Additional Information received from NRPS indicates that the complainant's address has been associated to 61 documented calls for service with the NRPS. Most of the calls are in relation to issues of a shared driveway and property line disagreements with a neighbour. The complainant's address was flagged regarding habitual complaints to police.

Niagara Regional Police Service Procedures

The NRPS Communications/Dispatch Procedure was reviewed. This included "CAD Call Type Priority Definitions", which outlines the criteria to determine the priority of a call, definitions of types of calls, goals, and objectives for each priority.

The complainant's call on July 5, 2024, was categorized as a Priority 3. The call response protocol was reviewed. Priority 3 calls are defined as Moderate Risk where violence just occurred, property crimes are in progress, and no weapons involved.

The complainant's call on October 11, 2024, was disconnected prior to receiving the complainant's information to generate a CAD incident number. This resulted in no Priority being assigned, and no dispatch of officers was made.

The complainant's call on October 13, 2024, was categorized as a Priority 6. The call response protocol was reviewed. Priority 6 calls are defined as Informational / No Police response which include Referral (to specific unit, Staff Sergeant, Outside Agency), Civil matter, Information only (no criminality/validity/cause for concern) and are not displayed on the status / call waiting screen.

The complainant's call on December 13, 2024, was categorized as a Priority 5. The call response protocol was reviewed. Priority 5 calls are defined as Minimal / No risk which include a past event, mobile response not required and includes mobile support unit guidelines.

The Dispatch/Communications procedure includes a provision that all Priority 1 through 5 calls will be entered into CAD and proceed to the call status screen for dispatch. Priority 6 calls are logged in CAD for record keeping, regardless of whether patrol units are dispatched. Priority 6 calls are automatically cleared and do not appear on the call status screen.

Niagara Regional Police Response

On July 5, 2024, officers responded and arrived on scene in 7 minutes after the call was made by the complainant.

On October 11, 2024, no officers were dispatched as the complainant's call was disconnected, and it was determined prior to disconnection by the call taker that no vehicle was blocking his driveway, and there appeared to be no reason for police to attend.

On October 13, 2024, no officers were dispatched as the complainant's call was categorized as a Priority 6 and defined as Information / No Police response, referred to a parking issue and not displayed on the status / call waiting screen.

On December 13th, 2024, officers responded and arrived on scene in 14 minutes after the call was made by the complainant. A police report was taken.

Complainant Interview

An interview was conducted with the complainant regarding his complaint.

The complainant stated and confirmed that he contacted the NRPS non-emergency number in March 2024, as well as in July, and October 2024, and he was not serviced properly by the police regarding his allegation of being threatened and harassed, indicating that there was no police response when he called the NRPS.

The complainant further indicated that there is an ongoing issue with people blocking his driveway and he has contacted the police and the city of Welland about this matter.

INVESTIGATION FINDINGS

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

- 1. On July 5th, 2024, at 4:45 p.m., the NRPS received a 911 call from the complainant's father regarding a male blocking his driveway and yelling at the complainant.. Two responding officers arrived on scene at 4:52 p.m. and determined that a verbal argument over a male parked and blocking the complainant's driveway had occurred. All involved parties were separated. No criminal offence occurred, and no police report was taken.**
 - a. The complainant indicated in his submission that he recalls his father had called NRPS, and alleges the male assaulted his father and by the time police showed up, the male had left the area.
 - b. The CAD transcript confirmed the call was received from the complainant but contradicts what the complainant stated had occurred.
- 2. On October 11, 2024, the complainant called NRPS and was disconnected by the complainant prior to providing information required to generate an incident number. The complainant was called back by the call taker and received information from the complainant that since the vehicle blocking his driveway had left, there did not appear to be a reason for police to attend.**
 - a. The complainant indicated in his submission that he called NRPS, and alleged that the call taker hung up on him.
 - b. NRPS confirmed the call was received by Communications and the complainant disconnected the call. The call taker called back the complainant.
- 3. On October 13, 2024, at 4:34 p.m., the complainant called NRPS regarding a neighbour's friend blocking his driveway and giving him the finger. The driveway was not currently blocked, and the complainant was advised that the police were not attending for someone giving him the finger. No police units were dispatched, and the call was cleared at 4:40 p.m.**
 - a. The complainant alleged in his submission that he called NRPS and was hung up on.
 - b. The CAD transcript confirmed the call was received from the complainant.

- 4. On December 13, 2024, at 11:24 a.m., the complainant called NRPS regarding motorcycles in the neighbourhood and vehicles blocking his driveway. Units were dispatched and attended the location and spoke with the complainant. Officers explained the limitations police have regarding motorcycle infractions/issues and reiterated to contact by-law for parking issues. A police report was taken.**
- 5. NRPS confirmed that they have advised the complainant that parking complaints are a city of Welland by-law matter and not a police matter.**
 - a. As per section 11(2)(a) of the Community Safety and Policing Act, by-law enforcement is not included in adequate and effective policing.
- 6. Additional information received from NRPS confirmed that the complainant's address has been associated to 61 documented calls for service with the NRPS. Most are born of issues of a shared driveway and property line disagreements with a neighbour. The complainant's address was flagged regarding habitual complaints to police.**

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