

Decision Regarding Findings Report INV-24-32 Concerning Policing Provided by the Windsor 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 Windsor Police Service (“WPS”), in which the police took four days to respond to a call-for-service regarding alleged harassment by the complainant’s landlord. An inspector with Ontario’s Inspectorate of Policing (“IoP”) investigated the complaint to determine whether the WPS 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 WPS has complied with the Act and the regulations.

II. BACKGROUND

- [3] The complainant reported repeated harassment by their landlord whenever the complainant and others were outside their apartment. Despite the complainant contacting WPS on a Tuesday, it was four days before an officer attended. The complainant further alleged that their call-for-service was closed and re-opened multiple times.
- [4] Upon first calling 911, the complainant was told that the call-for-service would not be treated as a priority call. Less than two hours later, WPS contacted the complainant to advise that a police response would be delayed. WPS then left a voicemail indicating an officer would not be able to attend that evening, and invited the complainant to call back the next day to re-open the call-for-service.
- [5] The complainant contacted the WPS each day following their original call - four consecutive days - and each time, requested the WPS attend and asked for an estimated arrival time. Finally, on Saturday, an officer arrived and spoke with the complainant and the landlord. In the end, each party agreed not to communicate with the other.

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 the course of the investigation, it became clear to the WPS officer that the main issue was a dispute about a fence or property line. The officer inquired about whether the complainant had contacted the city by-law enforcement about the various issues and disputes. The complainant advised they had done so in respect of other issues, but not in respect of the property line issue.

III. ISSUES

- [7] The sole issue here is whether the WPS delayed response constituted a failure to comply with the Act.

IV. ANALYSIS

WPS Records

- [8] The WPS computer-assisted dispatch (“CAD”) record memorializes the complainant’s original 911 call, which was assigned a Priority 3 rating. The call-taker noted the dispute apparently centered on a “messy yard” and a landlord blaming the complainant for putting a garbage mattress on his property. The CAD record also documented the complainant being advised of a delayed response, as well as a subsequent WPS officer leaving a voicemail message for the complainant asking that they call back the following day.
- [9] This course of events was repeated over the next several days, starting with the complainant calling to re-open the call before noon, and ending with a WPS officer leaving a voicemail message at day’s end for the complainant to call back the next day. Each time, the complainant would seek an estimated arrival time and was told there would be a lengthy delay before an officer could attend.
- [10] The CAD record also documented repeated views of the complainant’s call-for-service in the hours that the call remained in an “open” status. In other words, the WPS dispatch staff repeatedly reviewed the call-for-service while it remained an “open” call.
- [11] There is, however, no information on the record that WPS proactively contacted the complainant during that time to advise as to the lengthy delay in dispatching an officer.

[12] On Saturday, May 19, 2024, the complainant called the WPS back (for the fourth time) at 10:32 a.m. At 12:21 p.m., the status of the call was changed, and an officer was then dispatched. The officer arrived at 12:26 p.m. and cleared the call at 1:08 p.m., memorializing the discussion between the parties in an occurrence report. It documented that each party agreed to cease communication with the other, subject to discussing the property line issue.

[13] On the four days over which the complainant called, WPS records reveal there were dozens of higher-priority calls for service at the relevant times. Overall, there were a total of 101 Priority 1 calls and 153 Priority 2 calls in those four days. This would equate, on average, to 4.4 Priority 1 calls per officer and 6.7 Priority 2 calls per officer in that period.

WPS Procedures

[14] The WPS Communications/Dispatch Procedure (the “Procedure”) establishes a requirement to prioritize 911 calls into one of six response categories. Each category dictates what priority the call is assigned.

[15] The complainant’s call was initially assigned a Priority 3, which are “routine response” calls that require police involvement but are not considered urgent. Priority 3 calls anticipate a response time within one hour or as soon as practicable. Notably, the complainant’s call was assigned a Priority 3 by virtue of the alleged harassment - otherwise the complainant’s call would likely have been categorized as a Priority 4, being limited to a call-for-service relating to municipal by-law compliance.

[16] The Procedure also provides that a police unit from a neighbouring zone may be dispatched if one within the zone is not available within the required window of time. The dispatcher is authorized by the Procedure to dispatch a neighbouring zone police unit immediately if it is clear the one-hour window will not be met.

The WPS Response is Compliant and Reasonable

[17] Despite the lengthy delays, I am satisfied that the WPS was compliant with the applicable requirements of the Act and its regulations.

[18] Section 11 of the Act provides that:

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.

[19] Importantly, the enforcement of municipal by-laws is expressly excluded as an element of “adequate and effective policing” by subsection 11(2) of the Act. In other words, a police service is not required by the Act to enforce municipal bylaws as part of what is required to deliver “adequate and effective policing.”

[20] One of the “policing functions” prescribed by the Act’s regulations is addressed in section 15 of the *Adequate and Effective Policing (General)* regulation, O Reg 392/23 (the “Regulation”). It requires that:

Dispatching

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.

[21] Overall, the delivery of “adequate and effective” policing functions is always subject to a reasonableness standard. That standard is evaluated with regard to the factors listed in subsection 2(1) of the Regulation:

1. The policing needs of the community.
2. The geographic and socio-demographic characteristics of the police service’s area of policing responsibility.
3. The extent to and manner in which the policing function is effectively provided in similar communities in Ontario.
4. The extent to which past provision of the policing function by the police service has been effective in addressing the policing needs of the community.
5. Best practices respecting the policing function.

[22] The WPS’s delivery of policing complied with the applicable elements of the Act and the Regulation and was reasonable. The information available at the time of the various calls for service made by the complainant did not reveal any imminent public safety risk, or suggest that evidence that may be necessary to properly investigate a potential federal or provincial offence would not be available absent a more immediate police response. Given the call volume and severity present at the time for WPS to respond to, the reality is, the complainant’s concerns necessarily needed to be lower on the priority list.

[23] In terms of the reasonableness analysis, the WPS's operationalization of its statutory call taking, dispatch and response requirements are reasonable having regard to the need to balance more significant policing needs in the community relative to the practical reality that only so many front-line policing resources are available. This approach is consistent with previous decisions I have made concerning delayed responses to lower-priority calls for service, which recognize that competing operational demands and resource availability are relevant considerations when assessing whether adequate and effective policing has been provided.²

[24] In addition, the WPS's approach is similar in nature to how the policing functions of call taking, dispatch and priority response are operationalized by other, similar police services. Similar challenges relating to policing response delays, priority ratings and call-back processes have also been identified and examined in other jurisdictions where supervision and other operational considerations contributing to these delays were noted.³

Opportunities for Improvement

[25] Although I have found technical compliance with the Act's requirements, I nevertheless wish to offer several observations about the WPS Procedure and its impact in these types of circumstances.

[26] Firstly, I recognize that the WPS officers that were available on the days the complainant called were responding to higher priority calls at a considerable rate. Moreover, many (if not the majority) of those calls almost certainly required an in-depth police response and corollary obligations and activities (e.g. arrest and report-taking).

² *Decision Regarding Findings Report INV-24-22 Concerning Policing Provided by the Ottawa Police Service*, 17 December 2025: [ig-decision-and-findings-report-for-inv-24-10_english_package.pdf](#)

³ See for example, His Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services, *PEEL 2025–2027: An Inspection of Staffordshire Police*, 8 July 2026: <https://hmicfrs.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/publications/peel-assessment-2025-27-staffordshire/>

[27] Nonetheless, I am also inclined to urge the WPS to consider improvements to its call-taking and dispatch procedure and process, so as to ensure a more effective level of police service delivery related to call-taking, dispatch and supervision duties in the Call Centre. This will ensure calls are given the appropriate priority response, and that members of the public who are told they will receive a police response are kept informed about the timeline for that response and do not have to re-initiate their call-for-service.

[28] Some manner of ongoing “call-back” requirement would be beneficial, especially in circumstances where a police response is determined to be required but the dispatch times that WPS sets as its internal standard are not going to be met. This might be especially helpful to the public in circumstances where the delay results in a police response not being dispatched until the following day or beyond.

[29] I would have the WPS consider revising its Procedure so that a call-for-service that cannot be immediately dispatched (based on its priority rating) remains open until such time as the determination is made to close the call or dispatch an officer. It should not be incumbent upon a member of the public to have to repeatedly call back to “re-open” or “re-register” their call-for-service. This is not, in my view, an effective use of WPS call-taker resources, and is unfair to the public. I suggest that the WPS consider establishing some mechanism whereby a Call Centre supervisor reviews calls that are pending, determines whether any should be re-prioritized based on available information, and oversees call-backs in circumstances where the delay will be lengthy for a police response.

[30] Additionally, the complainant’s call-for-service was, at some point, elevated in priority rating. This occurred after several days of the complainant calling back and re-opening their call-for-service. A review of the Procedure should include more specific criteria for when a supervisor should review calls that are pending to determine if the priority assigned should be increased or decreased in the circumstances, as well as the criteria for making that determination.

[31] Finally, I would also urge the Windsor Police Service Board (“Board”) to consider whether it should review any of its existing policies, or perhaps develop a new policy, to set some governance priorities with respect to the matters of call-taking, dispatch and police response – including and especially, what the Board envisions insofar as the ‘customer service’ aspects of these policing functions. The call-taking and dispatch functions of a police service are among the most important to members of the public, who, on any given day, may need to resort to calling 911. For this reason, the Board should ensure that it has applied its governance mandate to this significant policing responsibility, and that it remains informed of how the WPS is performing in relation to the priorities the Board sets. Of course, any policy the Board puts in place should provide the chief of police with appropriate direction, and then it is for the chief to operationalize the Board’s governance with any reporting back the Board establishes.

V. CONCLUSION

[32] In conclusion, I find no evidence that the WPS failed to comply with the Act or its regulations. However, to improve overall performance, I strongly encourage the WPS and Windsor Police Service Board to take steps to strengthen call-taking, dispatch, supervisory oversight, communication with members of the public, and governance relating to police response expectations and service delivery.

Date: August 27, 2026

Original Signed By

Ryan Teschner
Inspector General of Policing

FINDINGS REPORT

Windsor Police Service

**Section 107(1)(a) Policing
Complaint Investigation**
(INV-24-32)

Submitted to:
Ryan Teschner
Inspector General of Policing of
Ontario

December 5, 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.....	5
SUMMARY OF THE INVESTIGATION CONDUCTED	5
Complainant Interview.....	5
Windsor Police Service Records	7
Windsor Police Service Procedures.....	8
Windsor Police Service Staffing Levels and Calls for Service May 15 to 18, 2024.....	9
INVESTIGATION FINDINGS	9

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

A written complaint was forwarded by the Law Enforcement Complaints Agency (LECA) to the Inspector General under the provisions of section 108 of the CSPA. The complainant alleged that the landlord of the building adjacent to theirs was repeatedly harassing them whenever they were outside their apartment at the same time as the landlord. The complainant contacted Windsor Police Service (WPS) regarding the matter on Tuesday May 15, 2024. However, they reported that an officer did not attend until Saturday, May 19, 2024, four days after their initial call. During this period, the complainant stated that the police call was closed and reopened multiple times. They also reported that the neighbouring landlord was accusing them of bylaw infractions. The complainant indicated that they intended to contact 311 to file a complaint but required a police officer to take their statement first.

The Subject Police Service

Name of Police Service: Windsor Police Service

Service Headquarters: 150 Goyeau Street, Windsor, Ontario, N9A 6J5

Chief of Police: Jason Crowley

Chief of Police since December 1, 2025

Service Total Strength: (Actual & Authorized)

- Number of sworn members:
Actual: 502
Authorized: 512
- Number of civilian members:
Actual: 173
Authorized: 175

Geographic Service Area

- City of Windsor 146.3 square kilometers
- Community Population of approximately 236,500
- City of Amherstburg 183.7 square kilometers
- Community Population of approximately 26,900

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

Complainant Interview

An interview was conducted with the complainant regarding their complaint.

The complainant confirmed that the original call was made to the WPS on Tuesday May 15, 2024, and that an officer did not attend until Saturday May 19, 2024.

The complainant advised that the original call was triaged by the call taker and that the police respond to calls in order of their emergent nature. The complainant was further advised that this call was not an emergency. This first call was made by the complainant at 3:19 p.m. and at 4:59 p.m., the complainant was contacted and advised that the police response would be delayed. The complainant advised that they shut off their phone sometime between 10:00 p.m. to 10:30 p.m. The complainant indicated that a message was left at approximately 10:50 p.m. advising that an officer could not attend that evening and to call back in the morning to reopen the call.

The complainant reports that on Wednesday May 16, 2024, they went to work until 12:00 p.m. and then had appointments and ran errands after that. The complainant called back at 4:20 p.m. and reopened the call. No officer attended and at 10:00 p.m., the complainant shut off their phone. The complainant advised that a message was left at approximately 10:50 p.m. advising that an officer could not attend that evening and to call back in the morning to reopen the call.

The complainant advised that on Thursday May 17, 2024, they called at 6:35 a.m. and advised they would be available after 9:30 a.m. The complainant reported that they called seeking an estimated time of arrival at 4:45 p.m., 5:50 p.m. and 11:07 p.m. On the last call the complainant advised that they would stay up until police arrived, however they were told that there would be a lengthy delay.

The complainant reports that on Friday May 18, 2024 at approximately 11:30 a.m., they called to request an estimated time of arrival. The complainant advised the call taker that they were not happy with the police response and were provided with the contact information to submit a complainant to LECA. The police did not attend on Friday.

The complainant advised that on Saturday May 19, 2024, at approximately 10:30 a.m. they called and inquired about an estimated time of arrival. The complainant received a call at approximately 12:25 p.m. that a unit was on route and a few minutes later an officer arrived. The officer spoke to the complainant and the neighbouring landlord. The complainant and the neighbouring landlord agreed to stop communicating with one another and the officer advised both parties to direct their fence line inquiries to the complainant's landlord. No statements were taken, and no police report was submitted.

The complainant advised that the original issue with the landlord of the neighbouring building was a fence line/property line issue as there was no fence erected separating the two properties. The complainant reports that the issue arose over the temporary "puppy fencing" that they would put up when their dogs were outside, as well as the parking of their truck. The complainant reported that the landlord did not live at the neighbouring address, and they were certain that the "puppy fencing" is what sparked the contact because the neighbouring landlord didn't like it being put up as he felt it crossed onto his property. There was a secondary issue pertaining to refuse disposal, and the complainant admitted that they had called the 3-1-1 bylaw number to complain about the neighbouring landlord regarding the dumping of a refrigerator on the property. This resulted in a "counter claim" that the complainant had disposed of a mattress on the property, which the complainant denied.

The complainant was asked if they had ever called Windsor Bylaw Enforcement about this matter since all the complaints pertaining to the fence line and the refuse disposal related to by-law offences. The complainant had advised that they had believed they had called regarding this incident. The complainant was able to review their multiple contacts with Windsor Bylaw Enforcement through a telephone application, as well as calls made to 3-1-1, however could not find one call related to the incident which sparked the present complainant. The review showed that the first call made to bylaw was in fact on June 13, 2024.

Windsor Police Service Records

Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) records show that on May 15, 2024, a call was received from the complainant at 3:19 p.m. and this call was assigned as a “Neighbor Trouble” call, with a priority level 3 designation. The call taker added initial remarks to the CAD that the complainant was having ongoing issues with next door landlord. The remarks further stated, “Complainant called by law on them for a messy yard and landlord now blamed her for putting a garbage mattress on his property.”

The CAD record for this call for service, shows that on Tuesday May 15, 2024, the complainant was notified of a delay in response at 4:59 p.m. Later, at 10:52 p.m., a message was left on the complainant's voicemail providing the case number and advising the complainant to call back the following day.

On Wednesday, May 16, 2024, the call was reopened at 4:25 p.m. At 10:51 p.m., a message was left on the complainant's voicemail advising the complainant to call back the following day.

On Thursday May 17, 2024, at 6:35 a.m. the call was reopened, and a note was added to the call at 6:36 a.m. that the complainant was upset about the multi day response delay. A “hold time” notice was added as the complainant had requested police attend after 9:30 a.m. The complainant called back at 4:44 p.m. asking for an estimated time of arrival and was advised there would be a lengthy delay. The complainant called back again at 5:51 p.m. and again asked for an estimated time of arrival and was advised again that there would be a lengthy delay. At 11:07 p.m. the complainant called back and inquired about an estimated time of arrival. Again, the complainant was advised of a lengthy delay however the complainant advised that they would stay up and wait for the arrival of the police.

On Friday May 18, 2024, at 11:30 a.m. the complainant called back and inquired about an estimated time of arrival. The complainant advised the call taker that they were not happy with the response time for the call and were provided with the information to contact the Law Enforcement Complaints Agency (LECA).

On Saturday May 19, 2024, at 10:32 a.m., the complainant called back and inquired about an estimated time of arrival. At 12:21 p.m. the status of the call was changed, and an officer was dispatched to the call. At 12:22 p.m. the officer was marked on route to the call. At 12:24 p.m. the complainant was contacted and advised an officer was on route. At 12:26 p.m. the officer arrived at the scene of the call.

At 1:08 p.m. the officer cleared the call and at 1:39 p.m. there was an entry into the occurrence that indicated the officer had “spoke to both parties, both agreed to cease communication moving forward, subject agreed to speak to their landlord regarding any further issues regarding property lines.”

Windsor Police Service Procedures

The Communications/Dispatch Procedure was reviewed, and the applicable procedure was identified as the Windsor Police Service Directive 751-01. The Communications and Dispatch procedure provides direction with regard to the anticipated response required for priority 3 calls for service.

Under 4.1 Differential Police Response (DRP) Options: Calls received by the Emergency 9-1-1 Centre shall be prioritized using a DPR Model. Calls for service shall fall into one of five response method categories. The categories shall dictate the response level (Priority 1 through 9). This call was classified as a priority #3 call.

Priority 3 calls are described as “Routine Response” events that require police involvement but do not require an emergent or urgent response but will be dispatched within 1 hour or as soon as practicable.

This complaint might have also fit within the Priority 4 classification given the primary issue involved by-law concerns. This category covers regulatory response events requiring police presence or situations where the complainant insists on a mobile response. However, the caller’s insistence on police attendance and mention of “harassment” meant that the priority classification remained at Priority 3. A straight referral to 3-1-1 may not have adequately addressed the complainant’s expectations or the perceived interpersonal nature of the issue.

In the same procedure, in section “Dispatching Calls for Service,” priority 3 or 4 calls shall be assigned at the discretion of the dispatcher to ensure a response time of not more than 1 hour for a priority 3 call and a timely response to priority 4 calls. In the event the zone patrol unit responsible for the location of the event is not available or it is anticipated will not be available, a neighbouring zone unit shall be dispatched based on proximity by GPS. If the Dispatcher knows the zone patrol unit will be unavailable for more than an hour, they can dispatch the neighbouring zone unit immediately; it does not need to wait 1 hour to be dispatched.

The ICAD for this event shows repeated views by dispatchers in the hours that the call was in open status.

Windsor Police Service Staffing Levels and Calls for Service May 15 to 18, 2024

The Service provided staffing data for May 15 – 18, 2024, noting no policy mandates a minimum number of officers per shift. Staffing levels are adjusted based on operational needs.

[redacted – s 1(1)1 – O Reg 317/24].

INVESTIGATION FINDINGS

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

- 1. On Tuesday, May 15, 2024, at 3:19 p.m., the complainant contacted the Windsor Police Service and made a complaint to a call taker that generated a police occurrence.**
 - a. This call was classified as a priority level 3 call and indicated the complainant was having ongoing issues with the next-door landlord. The remarks further stated, “The complainant called by law on them for a messy yard and now the landlord blames the complainant for putting a garbage mattress on his property.”
 - b. The complaint could have been classified as Priority 4 due to its by-law nature, which typically involves regulatory response or situations where a complainant insists on police presence. However, the caller’s insistence and mention of “harassment” kept the classification at Priority 3.
- 2. Although the call was received on Tuesday, May 15, 2024, an officer was not dispatched to attend the call until Saturday, May 19, 2024, at 12:21 p.m.**
 - a. On May 15, 2024, at 3:19 p.m. the complainant called the Windsor Police Service Communications and generated this call for service. The Windsor Police Service Communications contacted the complainant at 4:59 p.m. to advise that the police response would be delayed. At 10:52 p.m. the Windsor Police Service Communications unit left a message on the complainant’s phone with the occurrence number and to call back tomorrow.

- b. On May 16, 2024, at 4:25 p.m. the complainant called the Windsor Police Service Communications to reopen the call. At 10:51 p.m. the Windsor Police Service Communications unit left a message on the complainant's phone with the occurrence number and to call back tomorrow.
- c. On May 17, 2024, at 6:35 a.m., the complainant called the Windsor Police Service Communications to reopen the call and advised of their availability after 9:30 a.m. The complainant was upset about the multi day response delay. At 4:44 p.m. the complainant called back for an estimated time of arrival and was instead advised there would be a delay in response. The complainant called back at 5:51 p.m. and asked again about an estimated time of arrival and was advised there would be a lengthy delay. The complainant advised that they would wait up for police. The complainant called at 11:07 p.m. and inquired about an estimated time of arrival and was again advised that there would be a lengthy delay. The complainant advised that she would wait up.
- d. On May 18, 2024, at 11:30 a.m. the complainant called the Windsor Police Service Communications to obtain an estimated time of arrival for the police. The complainant indicated that they were not happy with the delay in response time and were provided with the contact information for LECA.
- e. On May 19, 2024, at 10:32 a.m. the complainant called the Windsor Police Service Communications to inquire about an estimated time of arrival. At 12:21 p.m. a police officer was dispatched to the call and at 12:22 p.m. that officer was on route to the call. The Windsor Police Service Communications unit called the complainant at 12:24 p.m. to advise that an officer was on route. At 12:26 p.m. the officer arrived at the location.

3. The complainant was not continuously available to speak to police over the 4-day period that the call was held for.

- a. On May 15, 2024, sometime between 10:00-10:30 p.m. the complainant shut off their phone and was not available to speak to the police.
- b. On May 16, 2024, the complainant did not reopen the call until 4:25 pm as the complainant went to work in the morning, had appointments and ran errands. The complainant shut off their phone at approximately 10:00 p.m. and was not available to speak with the police.

- c. On May 17, 2024, the complainant called the police at 6:35 a.m., however advised that they would not be available until after 9:30 a.m.
- 4. The Windsor Police Service procedures were reviewed and based on the priority designation, this call for service was set at “Routine Response.”**
 - a. This call was assigned as a priority level 3.
 - b. The procedure dictates the call to be dispatched within 1 hour or as soon as practicable.
- 5. The Windsor Police Service responded to a significant number of higher priority 1 and priority 2 calls for service between May 15, 2024, and May 18, 2024.**
 - a. Between May 15 and May 18, 2024, all available officers on both day and night shifts were fully engaged responding to higher priority calls for service, totaling 254 calls (101 Priority 1 and 153 Priority 2). These calls were higher priority than the complainant’s call.

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