

Decision Regarding Findings Report INV-24-11 Concerning Policing Provided by the Ottawa 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 Ottawa Police Service (“OPS”), alleging that conflicting practices between the OPS and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (“RCMP”) prevented the complainant, residing in British Columbia, from reporting alleged breaches of probation by a resident of Ottawa. An inspector with Ontario’s Inspectorate of Policing (“IoP”) investigated the complaint to determine whether the OPS 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 find that in these particular circumstances, the OPS delivered adequate and effective policing. However, I also find that the absence of a board policy and chief procedure addressing cross-jurisdictional reports of crime does not comply with the Act and its regulations.

II. BACKGROUND

- [3] I adopt the facts as found by the Inspector and outlined in the Findings Report.
- [4] To summarize, the complainant resides in Langley, British Columbia and became concerned about social media posts and other direct communications from an individual who resides in Ottawa and who was ostensibly prohibited from contacting the complainant or posting about them by virtue of an outstanding probation order.
- [5] Between June 2023 and August 2024, the complainant repeatedly contacted both the OPS – the police service of jurisdiction where the alleged offender lives – and the RCMP – the police service of jurisdiction where the complainant lives. The complainant sought to report the alleged breaches and have a police investigation commenced. The complainant became frustrated as each police service asserted that any criminal investigation was the responsibility of the other, and the complainant was bounced back and forth.

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 fact, two separate criminal investigations were undertaken by the OPS, in concert with the RCMP and the offender's probation officer, in August 2023 and February 2024. Both investigations concluded that the available evidence did not support a criminal charge at the time.

[7] In April 2024, the complainant again called the OPS to report more offending social media posts. The RCMP purportedly refused to accept a report unless the incidents were first reported to the OPS. The OPS, in turn, took the position that, in all of the circumstances, the RCMP was the appropriate police service to investigate. Moreover, the OPS instructed the complainant to stop calling them about this matter.

[8] There is no OPS policy or procedure that specifically addresses how the OPS are to deal with reports of cross-jurisdictional crime or crime outside of their territorial jurisdiction.

III. ISSUES

[9] The complaint raises two issues:

1. Did the OPS refusal to conduct a further criminal investigation after April 2024 constitute a failure to provide "adequate and effective policing"; and
2. Did the absence of an OPS policy or procedure to address cross-jurisdictional reports of crime constitute a failure to comply with the Act?

IV. ANALYSIS

[10] The ubiquitous presence of social media in the modern world has presented a host of new challenges for law enforcement and the administration of justice. Technologically-based offences now regularly leap across jurisdictional boundaries. The limits of jurisdiction imposed by territorial geography can complicate the investigation and prosecution because these are concepts that are not aligned with the absence of jurisdictional lines in the online world.

[11] In Canada, criminal law is a matter of federal jurisdiction and the *Criminal Code*, RSC 1985, c C-46, applies in every province and territory.² Furthermore, every Canadian court that has power to try an indictable offence can try an accused if the accused person “is found, is arrested or is in custody within the territorial jurisdiction of the court”.³

[12] Consequently, where an offence is committed that crosses multiple jurisdictions – e.g. inter-provincial frauds, electronic threats, or here, proscribed social media posts – the matter might be investigated and prosecuted in the jurisdiction in which the complainant is found, the jurisdiction in which the accused is found, or the jurisdiction in which an offence physically occurred.

[13] These realities of Canadian criminal law give rise to a duty on police services to cooperate with each other, sharing relevant intelligence and investigative resources wherever possible.⁴

Issue 1: The OPS provided an adequate and effective policing response

[14] To assess the adequacy of the OPS response, a more detailed review of the facts is required. The OPS received 12 calls for service from the complainant between June 11, 2023 and August 24, 2024. Four of the calls were related to this matter. The OPS generated occurrence reports for all four complaints, notwithstanding that the complainant resided in British Columbia.

[15] The first complaint resulted in an investigation supervised by the OPS Hate Crime Unit and in conjunction with the subject’s probation officer. The offending social media content was apparently removed with the assistance of the probation office.

²Section 7 of the *Criminal Code* also extends the criminal law jurisdiction of Canadian courts to offences that occur on planes while in flight, to a Canadian crew member during a space flight, to offences against diplomats, to offences involving nuclear material and to terrorism offences, among others.

³ Section 470, *Criminal Code*.

⁴ For example, see *Bernardo Investigation Review: Summary: Report of Mr. Justice Archie Campbell* (Toronto: Ontario Ministry of the Solicitor General, June 1996); and *Forsaken: Missing Women Commission of Inquiry*, (Vancouver: Government of British Columbia, November 2012).

- [16] The second matter involved allegations of threatening texts. The complainant was directed to provide a formal statement and screenshots to the Langley RCMP detachment, the police service of jurisdiction where she lived. She did so. The information was subsequently forwarded to the OPS. Following a file review by the OPS, the RCMP assumed carriage of the investigation. In the meantime, the OPS confirmed that the Ontario probation office was not pursuing criminal charges.
- [17] The third matter involved allegations that the subject was making posts on a new “X” account that breached conditions of the subject’s probation. Again, an OPS investigation was initiated, overseen by the OPS Hate Crime Unit. It concluded that although a criminal offence may have been committed, the evidence was insufficient to support a charge and that the complainant had previously been directed to report the matter to the RCMP.
- [18] The fourth matter alleged further offending social media posts by the subject. The complainant reported a concurrent civil matter in British Columbia involving a publication ban as well as a probation order relating to the subject. The complainant stated that the RCMP refused to accept a report unless the occurrence was first reported to the OPS. The OPS took the position that, in all of the circumstances, the totality of the offence was occurring in British Columbia. Nonetheless, the OPS generated an occurrence report but did not initiate a further investigation. Moreover, the OPS directed the complainant that they would not accept any further calls in respect of this matter.
- [19] The complainant’s perception of being “ping-ponged” between the OPS and the RCMP is understandable. Nevertheless, the facts do not support a conclusion that neither police service was responsive to the complainant’s reports. The OPS conducted or assisted in no less than three investigations relating to the allegations, engaging both the RCMP (in the complainant’s home jurisdiction) and the probation office (in the subject’s home jurisdiction).
- [20] None of the investigations resulted in criminal charges, but that is not the test for the provision of “adequate and effective policing.” The police retain a judicially-recognized discretion in the investigation of crime and the laying of criminal charges.⁵ Here, the complainant’s several allegations were documented and investigated by the OPS, after which the OPS exercised their discretion not to lay a criminal charge.

⁵ See *R v Beaudry*, 2007 SCC 5.

[21] I appreciate that the complainant found the resulting decision unsatisfactory, but that is an issue separate and apart from the provision of “adequate and effective policing”. Additionally, I understand that the complainant did not appreciate the subsequent OPS refusal to accept further reports. However, given the information provided by the complainant relating to the ongoing civil matters and outstanding probation orders in British Columbia, I cannot say that the OPS’s refusal to accept further reports was groundless and constituted a failure to provide the statutorily-required policing function. At a certain point in this chain of events, further complaints to the OPS about civil and probation matters that were so closely connected to British Columbia were futile. There was a police service better positioned to examine those matters, and the complainant was advised of this.

[22] In conclusion, I find that the OPS provided “adequate and effective” policing services as required by the Act.⁶

Issue 2: The lack of board policy or chief procedure related to out-of-jurisdiction complaints constitutes non-compliance with the Act

[23] The inspection conducted a thorough review of the OPS procedures, four of which were pertinent to this matter. None of the procedures, however, provided any guidance to the OPS’s members as to how to address out-of-town reporting or the triage, intake or investigation of cross-jurisdictional complaints of criminal offences.

[24] Subsection 38(1)(b) of the Act requires a police service board to establish policies concerning the delivery of “adequate and effective policing” in the jurisdiction for which it has policing responsibility. Subsection 79(4) further requires a chief of police to “establish written procedures regarding the administration of his or her police service and the provision of policing by the police service”. These obligations are subject to the requirements of the Act’s *Adequate and Effective Policing (General)* regulation, O Reg 392/23 (the “Regulation”).

[25] Section 2 of the Regulation makes the provision of any police function subject to a standard of “reasonableness”, having regard to the five factors:

1. The policing needs of the community.
2. The geographic and socio-demographic characteristics of the police service’s area of policing responsibility.

⁶ Note that I have no jurisdiction to address the provision of policing services by the RCMP.

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.

[26] In my view, “best practices” in the delivery of a police function must incorporate policies and procedures that ensure the best investigative outcomes as well as addressing the most important needs of the recipients of a policing function, be they victims of crime, witnesses or accused persons.

[27] In today’s world, borders and boundaries are less clear. An individual residing in British Columbia who is experiencing alleged criminality at the hands of someone in Ottawa might be challenged to understand why the OPS is not the appropriate organization to contact. In these circumstances, someone coming forward with allegations of criminality should not bear the burden of themselves sorting out which police organization should assume carriage of their criminal complaint.

[28] It is up to the policing organizations to have in place the relevant policies, procedures and established lines of communication to ensure that a complaint can be taken and appropriately investigated. To the extent that there are substantive reasons why the OPS is not the right entity, and does not have the responsibility to deliver policing to the complainant, these parameters should be codified in board policy and operationalized through a chief’s procedure. This will provide members of the OPS with the necessary clarity concerning how they should respond to matters where a complainant resides in a non-OPS jurisdiction. Aside from being good “customer service”, this also ensures that evidence is not lost and more immediate public safety risks can be addressed so as to minimize further harm and victimization.

[29] The OPS has already acknowledged in the course of this inspection that this is a gap. However, it is more than a gap driven by choice. I view a policy of this nature, and the chief’s procedures to operationalize that policy, as a substantive requirement based on my interpretation of subsection 38(1)(b) and subsection 79(3) and, in the case of the OPP, a policy by the Minister (subsection 60(1)(a)) and the implementation of that policy by the Commissioner of the OPP (subsection 79(2)(a)).

[30] For these reasons, I believe that the Act requires that the OPSB develop a specific Board policy and the Chief develop a corresponding procedure addressing criminal investigations of this nature. A policy and procedure will ensure that a consistent approach is taken to determining what role the OPS (as opposed to a police service in another jurisdiction) should play in investigating a cross-jurisdictional criminal complaint; the relevant factors that an OPS officer or supervisor should consider in exercising discretion as to whether to assume carriage of the investigation; and, embedding operational processes to ensure lines of communication with another police service that may be asked to assume carriage of the investigation are in place.

V. DIRECTION

[31] Pursuant to subsection 125(1) of the Act, I am permitted to issue a direction to remedy or prevent an act or omission that will likely result in non-compliance with the Act and its regulations. Having found non-compliance, I hereby direct the following occur:

1. The OPSB create and adopt a new policy, providing the Chief with appropriate direction on how complaints about alleged criminal offences by complainants from outside the OPS's jurisdiction should be addressed.
2. The Chief of Police create a procedure operationally implementing that Board policy.
3. The new Board policy and corresponding Chief's procedure be provided to my office within 90 days from the date of this decision.

Date: August 27, 2026

Original Signed By

Ryan Teschner
Inspector General of Policing

FINDINGS REPORT

Ottawa Police Service

**Section 107(1)(a) Policing
Complaint Investigation**
(INV-24-11)

Submitted to:
Ryan Teschner
Inspector General of Policing of
Ontario

July 7, 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.....	5
SUMMARY OF THE INVESTIGATION CONDUCTED	5
Information From the Complainant	5
Ottawa Police Service Records	6
Ottawa Police Service Procedures	8
Internal Correspondence and Officer Notes.....	9
Correspondence with the Local RCMP Detachment	10
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. Taschner 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 from the Law Enforcement Complaints Agency (LECA) to the Inspector General under the provisions of section 108 of the CSPA. The complaint alleged that the Ottawa Police Service (OPS) was not actioning reports of an individual allegedly breaching the conditions of their probation. The complainant resides in British Columbia, while the alleged offender was living in Ottawa at the time of the complaint.

The complainant reported that conflicting policies between the OPS and their local Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) detachment prevented them from reporting the alleged breaches. According to the complainant, the RCMP requires that criminal offences be reported in the jurisdiction where they occurred, whereas the OPS advised that reports should be filed where the victim resides.

This discrepancy, the complainant argued, left them unable to report the alleged probation violations. They expressed concern that such conflicting procedures create a sense of injustice, encourage further criminal behaviour, and compromise public safety.

The Subject Police Service

Name of Police Service: Ottawa Police Service

Service Headquarters: 474 Elgin Street, Ottawa, Ontario, K2P 2J6

Chief of Police: Chief Eric Stubbs

Chief of Police since November 2022

Service Total Strength: (Actual & Authorized)

- Number of sworn members:
Actual: 1584, Authorized: 1570
- Number of civilian members:
Actual: 706, Authorized: 717

Geographic Service Area

- 2778 Square Kilometers
- Community Population of approximately 1.11 million

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 135/24: TRANSITIONAL MATTERS

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

SUMMARY OF THE INVESTIGATION CONDUCTED

Information From the Complainant

The complainant provided a lengthy letter that did not identify a specific incident for investigation. The complainant was asked on multiple occasions, both in writing and via telephone conversations, to provide a statement outlining specific incidents with corresponding dates which could be investigated.

Despite these requests, the complainant was unable to narrow the initial complaint. They did, however, provide a large amount of information that offered limited context. The complainant did add that they believed that established policies had negatively impacted their ability to make a complaint.

The substance of the complaint was that because the complainant resided out of province, the OPS were not taking reports, investigating or cooperating in the investigation of alleged breaches of probation by a resident of Ottawa.

Ottawa Police Service Records

The OPS provided records which included CAD calls and the related occurrences for a total of 12 calls for service between June 11, 2023, and August 24, 2024. All 12 of these events are related to the complainant and have been reviewed as part of this investigation. Of the 12 events, 4 were found to be related to this investigation. These are occurrences reported on June 11, 2023, August 30, 2023, February 8, 2024, and April 11, 2024.

On June 11, 2023, the complainant called the OPS to report an alleged breach of conditions by a subject who resided in Ottawa. The complainant resided in British Columbia and reported a history with the subject individual dating back to 2020.

A general occurrence report was generated in accordance with OPS procedures and an investigation was conducted. A supervisor from the OPS Hate Crime Unit was assigned. On July 4, 2023, a supplementary report was added, indicating that the subject's Probation Officer was working with the individual to remove all posted social media content as directed.

On August 30, 2023, the complainant called the OPS to report receiving threatening text messages from the subject. The complainant was advised by the OPS to provide a formal statement and screenshots of the messages to the Langley, RCMP, who could then forward the information to the OPS.

A general occurrence report was generated, and an investigation initiated. Prior to the complainant reporting this, the complainant had provided RCMP Langley with information. On August 26, 2023, the RCMP in Langley British Columbia provided the OPS with information obtained from the complainant for review by an investigator, which was added to the OPS occurrence. On September 4, 2023, a Sergeant from the OPS added a supplementary report, noting that following a file review, the RCMP would assume the role of lead investigative agency. On September 5, 2023, the subject's Probation Officer confirmed that no charges were going to be laid.

On these occasions prior to February 8, 2024 occurrence reports were taken. The OPS subsequently determined that the reports and the investigations should have been completed by the police service having jurisdiction where the complainant resided. On February 8, 2024 internal correspondence indicates that officers were directed not to take anymore occurrences from the complainant but instead to refer the complainant to there local RCMP detachment.

On February 8, 2024, the complainant called the OPS to report an alleged breach of conditions by the subject who still resided in Ottawa. The complainant alleged that the subject had created a new “X” account and was making posts that referenced the complainant.

A general occurrence report was created, and an investigation commenced. On February 9, 2024, a supervisor from the OPS Hate Crimes unit added a supplementary report, which cleared the occurrence as insufficient evidence to proceed. The report acknowledged that a criminal offence may have occurred but noted that the available evidence was insufficient or conflicting. The supervisor further documented that the complainant resided in British Columbia and had previously been directed to report the matter to the police in their local jurisdiction.

On April 11, 2024, the complainant contacted the OPS following a series of calls to both the OPS and the Langley RCMP in British Columbia. The complainant expressed frustration after attempting for approximately two weeks to have the matter addressed. They reported that the subject continued to post material on social media referencing the complainant, despite conditions prohibiting such activity. The complainant further advised that there was an ongoing civil matter in British Columbia involving a publication ban, as well as an active probation order concerning the subject. The complainant stated that the RCMP had advised they would not accept a report unless the occurrences were first reported to OPS. Conversely, OPS advised that it could not investigate, as the totality of the circumstances occurred in British Columbia.

As a result of the call, a general occurrence report was generated; however, it was created for administrative purposes only and not for investigation. The report documented that the reporting officer consulted with supervisors and that OPS would not be investigating. The occurrence indicated that the information was to be forwarded to the Langley RCMP for review and potential investigation. The occurrence was again cleared as insufficient evidence to proceed. The report noted that while a criminal offence appeared to have occurred, the evidence was insufficient or conflicting, and police were unable to substantiate the laying of charges.

The complainant provided an audio file of a phone conversation with an OPS officer on October 15, 2024, in which the officer is heard clearly stating that the complainant has been instructed not to call the OPS, and that the complainant has been previously instructed on numerous occasions not to call the OPS about this matter.

Ottawa Police Service Procedures

The OPS provided a total of 21 different procedures, each of which was reviewed as a part of this investigation. Of the procedures provided, four procedures were found to be relevant to this investigation.

The first procedure relevant to this matter is OPS Directive 22-1, titled “Ottawa Centre for Probation and Parole.” This procedure clearly outlines that the Ottawa Centre for Probation and Parole is responsible for submitting reports when an individual is alleged to have breached their parole or probation conditions. There is direction that the reports will be submitted on-line and automatically approved. Once transcribed the occurrence will not be routed for investigation, but rather an email will be auto generated and sent to the court liaison for their attention and follow up.

The second procedure relevant to this matter is OPS Directive 1070.2, titled “Communications Centre-Sectional Operating Procedure Breach/Court Orders and Probation.” This procedure specifies that breaches of parole or probation are not to be assigned to the Police Reporting Unit (PRU). The procedure further outlines the types of “Breaches” that require a police response. These include breach of probation, with the exception of “non-communication and no-contact orders.” Police response is also required for breaches of a conditional sentence, breaches of parole, and breaches of recognizance.

The third procedure relevant to this matter is OPS Directive 5.16, titled “Hate/Bias Crime and Hate Propaganda.” The complainant indicated in one of the reports that negative comments were directed toward the LGBTQ+ community. Therefore, it is appropriate to consider the direction provided in this procedure. Section D of this procedure outlines the role of members of the Hate Crime Unit play in such investigations. Based on the procedure and the correspondence obtained from the OPS, it is clear that a member of the Hate Crime Unit was involved in the decision-making process. This involvement contributed to the determination that the complainant should be referred to the police in their local jurisdiction to complete the required reports and have the reported matters investigated.

The fourth procedure relevant to this matter is a unit specific procedure for the Police Reporting Unit (PRU) when dealing with calls related to breaches of undertaking, recognizance, failure to appear, breaches of recognize under section 810, breach of probation and breach of probation (auto approved). This procedure provides several directions to officers. PRU members are directed to not take reports over the phone for breach of parole or breach of probation, with some minor exceptions which relate to victim safety where a wellness check may be required. This procedure explains that a

patrol unit must be dispatched to secure a written statement from the victim or complainant and the attending officer must sign their RMS report and submit it to the probation officer when there is an allegation of a breach of probation. This procedure also specifies that if a surety calls to advise of a breach of conditions by a subject charged in another jurisdiction, but whose conditions require them to reside in the Ottawa area, a report is to be taken by the Police Reporting Unit.

A review of all relevant procedures did not identify any directives that specifically address out of town reporting, nor did it reveal any procedures that prohibit members of the OPS from accepting reports from individuals calling from outside the city. Additionally, the OPS confirmed that there is no standalone service procedure that explicitly governs the intake and triage of inter-jurisdictional criminal complaints or breach allegations. (This has been identified by the OPS as a gap in their internal procedures which they plan to address.) The Criminal Investigations Framework establishes investigative obligations once an investigation is undertaken, but it does not address intake, triage, or decision-making for externally reported criminal allegations.

Internal Correspondence and Officer Notes

A review of internal correspondence and officers' notes provided added insight into the position of the OPS with regard to the complaints being made.

On February 8, 2024, internal correspondence from an officer in the Hate Crime Unit advised that officers from the services PRU were not to take calls from the complainant, and that officers were to report the incident to the local RCMP who had been made aware of the situation. Additional internal correspondence indicated that the probation order in question was a British Columbia probation order and was not enforceable outside the province.

On or about April 2, 2024 there was additional evidence within the internal correspondence provided by the OPS that indicates an officer spoke to the complainant. The officer was advised by the complainant that members of the PRU declined to take a report from them but directed them to report to their local RCMP detachment. The officer verified this and confirmed that the PRU were not taking the reports but directing the complainant to report to their home agency. The officer provided his email as a courtesy. The officer indicated he received emails from the complainant until May 16, 2024.

Correspondence with the Local RCMP Detachment

The OPS was able to provide evidence of communications with the RCMP detachment where the complainant resides. The correspondence provided took place after April 9, 2024. There have been communications between the two services in relation to how to best address the complainants' concerns.

There is evidence in an email dated April 30, 2024, advising members of the OPS that the complainant had been requested not to call or email the OPS until such time that a file review had been conducted and the RCMP were able to provide feedback.

INVESTIGATION FINDINGS

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

1. **OPS records for the time of the complaint demonstrated that between June 2023 and August 2024 the complainant contacted the OPS directly on four separate occasions for matters related to this investigation.**
 - a. On all four occasions a call was generated by OPS communications and an occurrence report was taken over the telephone, which is not in compliance with OPS procedures and appears to have been done to assist the complainant.
 - b. All the occurrences have been marked cleared insufficient evidence to proceed, and although all indicate a criminal offence may have occurred there is insufficient or conflicting evidence, and the OPS could not substantiate a charge.
 - c. There is evidence that the complainant had been directed on multiple occasions that they would have to report the occurrences to the police of local jurisdiction in Langley, British Columbia.
 - d. In April and June of 2024 occurrence reports were completed and forwarded to the RCMP for investigation.
2. **Four OPS procedures relevant to this investigation were examined.**
 - a. There is evidence that, in the case of a Breach of Probation occurrence, a written statement must be obtained from the victim/ complainant and the officer attending must sign his/her RMS report and submit to the probation officer.

- b. There was no evidence of a specific policy which directed officers not to report on an occurrence which was sourced from an out of jurisdiction complainant.
- c. The OPS provided a direct response to an inquiry about a service wide procedure regarding intake and triage of out-of-town reports and it was determined that there was not one. This was identified as a gap in their policy and procedures.
- d. There were unit specific policies which addressed how certain types of occurrences could not be taken over the phone, and what attending officers were required to do for in person reports that could not be taken over the phone, but there was nothing specific to out of town report taking and triage.

3. OPS internal correspondence and officer notes clarified their position regarding the complaints made by the complainant.

- a. On February 8, 2024, internal correspondence indicated that members of the OPS were not to take reports from the complainant regarding this matter and that officers were to contact the RCMP and advise them. The correspondence indicates that the RCMP were aware of this direction.
- b. On April 2, 2024, internal correspondence supports that the complainant had been told by members of the OPS to report their complaints to their local RCMP detachment.
- c. On April 11, 2024, internal correspondence shows that the complainant was again advised that they were to make reports to their local RCMP detachment.

4. OPS correspondence (Email) and CPIC messages demonstrated that they were working cooperatively with the local detachment of the RCMP. This evidence post-dates the date of the complaint.

- a. There was evidence that the OPS and RCMP were communicating and sharing information and attempting to resolve the complainant's reporting issue.
- b. There is evidence that the RCMP had, by April 30, 2024, provided the complainant with direction that the complainant was not to report these incidents to the OPS.
- c. There is evidence that on October 15, 2024, the complainant was continuing to call the OPS in relation to these matters.

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