

Decision Regarding Findings Report INV-25-20 Concerning Policing Provided by the Thunder Bay 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 Thunder Bay Police Service (“TBPS”), alleging that police failed to respond adequately to repeated reports of harassment by the complainant. An inspector with Ontario’s Inspectorate of Policing (“IoP”) investigated the complaint to determine whether the TBPS 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 TBPS has complied with the Act and the regulations.

II. BACKGROUND

[3] The complainant reports being harassed by a family member since 2023, and first contacted TBPS about this within the last two years. An officer with the TBPS verbally cautioned the alleged harasser, and the complainant was satisfied with this response.

[4] Still, the complainant alleged that the harassment continued. The complainant contacted the TBPS repeatedly over the next several months, insisting they did not receive any response. The complainant felt they were being dismissed.

III. ISSUES

[5] Did the TBPS deliver adequate and effective policing in compliance with the Act and its regulations?

IV. ANALYSIS

[6] I adopt the facts as outlined by the inspector in the Findings Report.

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.

TBPS Records

- [7] The inspector carefully examined TBPS records in relation to the complainant's allegations of harassment. The examination revealed five (5) occurrence reports completed by various members of the TBPS.

Occurrence Report 1: January 13, 2024

- [8] Following the complainant's call, a TBPS officer was dispatched to the residence in respect of a reported family dispute. The complainant was not home when the officer arrived, but the officer was instead invited to meet the complainant at a local coffee shop. There, the officer took a detailed account of the complainant's harassment allegations. The officer then contacted the purported harasser, who stated they had not been in contact with the complainant for some fifteen years. The officer nonetheless cautioned the individual to avoid any contact in the future. The report documents that all parties were satisfied and no further action was required.

Occurrence Report 2: January 17, 2024

- [9] The TBPS was requested to follow up regarding new allegations by the complainant of continued harassment. A TBPS officer contacted the complainant and determined the allegations were the same as those already addressed earlier in the week. The officer reminded the complainant that the alleged harasser had been cautioned.

Occurrence Report 3: March 15, 2024

- [10] A TBPS officer was dispatched to the complainant's residence regarding allegations of further harassment. The complainant was not at home upon police arrival, so the officer contacted the complainant by phone. Once again, the officer confirmed that the harassment allegations were the same as the original ones from January that had already been addressed. Moreover, the complainant was unable to provide any evidence of continued harassment. Nevertheless, the complainant was advised to contact 911 should they require future assistance.

Occurrence Report 4: April 3, 2024

[11] The alleged harasser attended TBPS Headquarters to report that the complainant had contacted them via Facebook. A TBPS cadet completed a general occurrence report, recording that the individual has already blocked the complainant and had not responded to the message. No further action was taken.

Occurrence Report 5: June 7, 2024

[12] A TBPS cadet was tasked with contacting the complainant, who had left a voicemail with the Chief's Office. The number left on the voicemail was called by the cadet, but the number was out of service. No further action was taken.

Legal Test

[13] "Adequate and effective policing" is defined in subsection 11(1) of the Act, and requires that all six (6) of the described policing functions are provided in accordance with the standards set out in the regulations, and with the requirements of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* and the *Human Rights Code*.²

[14] The standard prescribed by regulation is defined in subsection 2(1) of the *Adequate and Effective Policing (General)*, O Reg 392/23. It requires that every policing function be provided in a reasonable manner, having regard to the following factors:

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.

² The six (6) required policing functions are:

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.

[15] The two policing functions primarily engaged by the complainant's allegations are i) emergency response, and ii) law enforcement.

[16] Here, the TBPS responded appropriately to the complainant's first call for assistance. The matters came to the attention of TBPS supervisors, an officer was dispatched in a timely fashion, and an appropriate investigation was conducted to determine whether a criminal offence had been committed. Ultimately, the investigating officer did not lay any charges based on the information available. Despite the suggestion that there may not have been any contact between the complainant and the alleged harasser, the officer still took the additional step of cautioning the alleged harasser and reporting same to the complainant.

[17] In respect of the complainant's later calls to the TBPS, I am of the view that the complainant was either confused or was simply abusing the ability to contact the TBPS. The initial complaint had been fully addressed, even (according to the complainant) to their satisfaction. No new facts had emerged in terms of any new alleged harassment in any of the subsequent calls the complainant made to the TBPS.

[18] Based on the 4th occurrence, it would seem that the complainant was actually contacting the alleged harasser against their wishes.

[19] The complainant initiated no less than five separate calls to the TBPS, all of which generated police response and work, and four of which did not give rise to any indication that anything had in fact happened. Moreover, it seems that the complainant, unhappy with the police response to date, initiated contact with the very person they accused of harassing them. In all the circumstances, I am concerned that the complainant may be the one doing the pestering here.

[20] Nevertheless, I am satisfied that the TBPS delivery of both policing functions – emergency response and law enforcement – met the standard of reasonableness required by the Act in all of the circumstances.

V. CONCLUSION

[21] The TBPS took each new report by the complainant seriously, assigned policing resources to probe the matters and documented the response each time. In the circumstances, I am certainly of the view that the policing response was adequate and effective.

[22] Accordingly, no further action need be taken.

Date: September 3, 2026

Original Signed By

Ryan Teschner
Inspector General of Policing

FINDINGS REPORT

Thunder Bay Police Service

**Section 107(1)(a) Policing
Complaint Investigation**
(INV-25-20)

Submitted to:
Ryan Teschner
Inspector General of Policing of
Ontario

July 20, 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
Complainant Interview.....	5
Thunder Bay Police Service Data Collection and Analysis	5
INVESTIGATION FINDINGS	7

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 forwarded by the Law Enforcement Complaints Agency (LECA) to the Inspector General of Policing, under the provisions of section 108 of the CSPA. The complainant claims that they have experienced ongoing harassment and provided a detailed account of various incidents. The complainant states that they have reached out to the Thunder Bay Police Service (TBPS) on several occasions to report the harassment and seek assistance but alleges that they have never received an adequate response.

The Subject Police Service

Name of Police Service: Thunder Bay Police Service

Service Headquarters: 1200 Balmoral St., Thunder Bay, ON

Chief of Police: Darcy Fleury

Chief of Police since May 15, 2023

Service Total Strength: (Actual & Authorized)

- Sworn - 255
- Civilian - 140

Geographic Service Area

- 678 Square Kilometers
- Community Population of approximately 117,000

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

Complainant Interview

An interview was conducted with the complainant to gather additional details regarding their complaint.

During the interview, the complainant provided a detailed account of ongoing harassment from a family member dating back to 2023. The complainant claimed that they first contacted TBPS regarding the alleged harassment sometime in the last two years. At this time, they claimed to have spoken to a Sergeant who was helpful and verbally warned the suspect of the alleged harassment. The complainant was satisfied with this response.

The complainant claimed to have subsequently contacted TBPS two-to-three months after the first call to report ongoing harassment from the same family member. At this time an officer from TBPS met the complainant at a local Tim Hortons. The complainant was unable to recall what action was taken by TBPS to address this report. The complainant stated that they felt they were being dismissed.

After this meeting, the complainant claimed to make several phone calls to TBPS over the next several months to report the alleged harassment. The complainant alleges that they did not receive a response from TBPS.

After several unanswered calls to TBPS, the complainant called 911 to report the harassment. In response to this call, an officer from the TBPS responded to the complainant's home. The complainant was not home at the time, but they received a telephone call from an officer in relation to the 911 call. Again, the complainant claimed that they felt they were being dismissed.

Near the end of the interview, the complainant stated that they no longer bother contacting the police.

Thunder Bay Police Service Data Collection and Analysis

An investigation into the complaint revealed that the TBPS had a total of five General and Supplementary Occurrence Reports relating to the complainant and allegations of harassment.

The first General Report was dated January 13, 2024. On this date a Constable with TBPS was dispatched to the residence of the complainant in response to a family dispute. Upon arrival the Constable spoke with another resident who advised that the complainant was not home but would like to meet the officer at a local Tim Hortons. In response, the Constable promptly returned to his vehicle and proceeded to Tim Hortons to meet with the complainant. At this time the complainant provided a detailed account of the harassment allegations to the Constable. In response, the Constable contacted the individual who allegedly committed harassment and verbally cautioned the individual. The individual stated that they had not been in contact with the complainant in fifteen years and agreed to not contact the complainant. The report states that all parties were satisfied, and no further action was required.

On January 17, 2024, a Constable with TBPS was contacted via email by a Staff Sergeant and requested that the Constable follow-up with the complainant regarding new allegations of harassment. In response, the Constable contacted the complainant via telephone. The Constable reported that the allegations were the same that were dealt with on January 13. The Constable advised the complainant that the alleged suspect had already been spoken to by police. The interaction was documented by the Constable in a Supplementary Report. No further action was taken.

On March 15, 2024, a Constable with TBPS was dispatched to the residence of the complainant per the Watch Commander. The Constable was dispatched after the Watch Commander was contacted via telephone by the complainant several times to report allegations of harassment. The complainant was not home at the time, so the Constable contacted the complainant via telephone. The Constable recorded that the harassment allegations were the same as the report made on January 13. The Constable also reported that the complainant could not provide any evidence to support the harassment allegations. The information was put into a General Report and the Constable instructed the complainant to contact 911 should they require further assistance.

On April 3, 2024, the individual who allegedly committed the harassment attended TBPS headquarters and reported that they had been contacted via Facebook by the complainant. A cadet with TBPS recorded that the individual had blocked the complainant on Facebook and had not responded to the message. The cadet also reported that the message was non-threatening in nature. The information was documented in a General Report. No further action was taken.

On June 7, 2024, a cadet working at TBPS Headquarters was tasked by the Watch Commander to contact the complainant via telephone to follow-up with a voicemail received at the Chief's office. The cadet attempted to contact the complainant but reported that the number was out of service. The information was documented in a Supplementary Report. No further action was taken.

INVESTIGATION FINDINGS

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

- 1. The complainant contacted TBPS to report allegations of harassment on January 13, 2024. A Constable with TBPS was dispatched at the time of the report.**
 - a. The Constable met with the complainant at a local Tim Hortons as requested by the complainant. The Constable documented the allegations of harassment in a General Report and contacted the individual who allegedly committed the harassment. The individual claimed they had not been in contact with the complainant in fifteen years and agreed not to contact the complainant.
 - b. The General Report states that all parties were satisfied, and no further action was required.
- 2. The complainant made subsequent reports of harassment to TBPS. Officers at TBPS documented the reports but did not take any further action.**
 - a. In response to one of the reports, a Constable with TBPS responded to the complainant via telephone. The Constable stated that the information reported was the same as the previous report. No action was taken.
 - b. In response to another report, a Constable with TBPS was dispatched, however the complainant was not home at the time. The Constable then contacted the complainant via telephone. The Constable reported that the complainant could not provide evidence to support the harassment allegations.

- c. In response to a voicemail received at the Chief's office, a cadet attempted to contact the complainant via telephone, however, the cadet reported that the number was out of service.

3. The individual alleged to have committed the harassment has made claims to TBPS to refute the allegations.

- a. When contacted by TBPS via telephone, the individual claimed that they have not had contact with the complainant in fifteen years.
- b. The individual attended TBPS Headquarters to report to Officers that they had been contacted by the complainant via Facebook. Officers reported that the individual did not respond to the complainant and blocked the complainant on Facebook.

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