

Decision Regarding Findings Report INV-25-14 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 the police responded inadequately to several calls for service regarding an unwanted individual who repeatedly appeared at a residence. 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 conclude that the OPS has complied with the Act and the regulations.

II. BACKGROUND

- [3] The complainant reported concerns regarding the 911 dispatch and subsequent police response to several incidents involving a man repeatedly attending the residence of a friend of the complainant.
- [4] The first incident occurred on February 22, 2024, when the individual in question appeared at the friend’s home, banged on their front window and yelled at them. The complainant and friend understandably believed that no action had been taken by police, given an absence of feedback by police at the time.
- [5] In fact, OPS records reveal that police responded to the call-for-service, located the individual, identified him, and issued him a provincial offences ticket for trespassing.
- [6] The second incident occurred on June 19, 2024. OPS records reveal that police received a 911 call shortly after 8:00 a.m. regarding an individual who rang the friend’s doorbell, asked the children their names and wrote troubling comments on the sidewalk out front with chalk. The call was assigned a priority 3 and an officer was dispatched, arriving at 8:27 a.m.
- [7] The attending officer, Witness Officer 1, spoke with the children’s parents. The parents described the individual lingering near their home that day, approaching

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.

the children and asking their names, and subsequently finding disturbing messages written in chalk on the sidewalk outside their home. The parents also confirmed that it was the same individual who had approached their children in February when they had called police.

[8] Witness Officer 1 confirmed the February call-for-service and the individual's identity from OPS records, learning as well that the individual was listed on the sex offender registry. Despite this, and the surrounding circumstances, the officer concluded "...no evidence that [the individual] is for sure involved in today's incident. At this time there are no grounds that a criminal offence has taken place."

[9] An OPS staff sergeant subsequently reviewed the morning call-for-service and subsequent information about this matter collected through other calls throughout the day. A second officer, Witness Officer 2, was assigned later that day to investigate the matter further and spoke with the parents that evening.

[10] Witness Officer 2's subsequent investigation included confirming the individual's identity through a comparison of a recent mugshot of the individual to a photograph taken that day by the parents, securing photographs of the scooter and chalk sidewalk messages, and taking formal statements to more fully document the circumstances. Witness Officer 2 ultimately concluded that there were reasonable grounds to believe the individual had committed a criminal offence. The officer undertook unsuccessful efforts to locate the individual that night, but circulated an email to all OPS officers advising of the grounds to arrest the individual.

[11] The next morning, Witness Officer 3, having read the email, located and arrested the individual.

III. ISSUES

[12] The issue raised in this complaint is whether the OPS complied with the Act and the *Adequate and Effective Policing (General)* regulation, O Reg 392/23 (the "Regulation") in its response to the call-for-service.

IV. ANALYSIS

[13] Despite the delay in locating and arresting the individual, I am satisfied that the OPS was compliant with the applicable requirements of the Act and the Regulation.

[14] 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.

[15] 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.

[16] Here, the Act requires me to look at the overall issue, as opposed to the conduct of any individual member of the police service.²

[17] I have no concerns with the call-taking and dispatch approach overall and its specific application in this instance. While some may suggest that the call prioritization decision could have been different, this is ultimately a subjective decision based on the information immediately available to the call-taker. There is nothing to indicate that there are issues with the system in place for categorizing

² Section 111 of the Act provides that the Inspector General may not conduct investigations “for the purpose of determining whether a police officer or special constable has engaged in conduct that constitutes misconduct”.

calls for OPS that led to any failure to deliver adequate and effective policing in this instance.

[18] The inconsistency between the approach of the officer who first attended and the one who subsequently attended is concerning on its face, and based on the information in the record before me.

[19] Nonetheless, the OPS internal oversight process in place at the time appears to have functioned properly. The initial investigation conducted by Witness Officer 1 was reviewed by a superior officer that day, and combined with additional information gathered in the course of that day, led to a follow-up investigation that ultimately resulted in the individual's arrest the next morning. Ultimately, the OPS did what was necessary to deliver adequate and effective policing such that public safety was not compromised.

V. CONCLUSION

[20] In conclusion, I find no evidence that the OPS failed to comply with the Act or the Regulation.

[21] As already discussed, the conduct of individual officers is beyond my purview. Based on the information before me, I believe the requirement for me to notify the Complaints Director of the Law Enforcement Complaints Agency has been triggered, and I will be making this notification.³

Date: September 24, 2026

Original Signed By

Ryan Teschner
Inspector General of Policing

³ Subsection 120(2) reads:

Misconduct notice

120 (2) If, in the course of an inspection under this Part, an inspector becomes aware that a police officer, a special constable employed by the Niagara Parks Commission, a member of a police service board, an O.P.P. detachment board or a First Nation O.P.P. board or a peace officer in the Legislative Protective Service may have engaged in conduct that constitutes misconduct,

(a) the inspector shall notify the Inspector General; and

(b) if the misconduct is alleged to have been committed by a police officer, a special constable employed by the Niagara Parks commission or a peace officer in the Legislative Protective Service, the Inspector General shall notify the Complaints Director.

FINDINGS REPORT

Ottawa Police Service

**Section 107(1)(a) Policing
Complaint Investigation**
(INV-25-14)

Submitted to:
Ryan Teschner
Inspector General of Policing of
Ontario

July 13, 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
Information from Complainant	5
Ottawa Police Service Records	6
Ottawa Police Service Procedure.....	10
Ottawa Police Service Call-taker / Dispatcher Training.....	11
Involved Call-taker / Dispatcher Training Status	12
INVESTIGATION FINDINGS	12

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 of Policing under the provisions of section 108 of the CSPA. It was alleged that the Ottawa Police Service (OPS) failed to provide adequate and effective police service by failing to send officers to a call made regarding an unwanted individual at a residence.

The Subject Police Service

Name of Police Service: Ottawa Police Service

Service Headquarters: 474 Elgin St., Ottawa, ON K2P 2E6

Chief of Police: 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.

SUMMARY OF THE INVESTIGATION CONDUCTED

Information from Complainant

The complainant reported concerns regarding the police and 911 dispatch response to incidents involving an individual who repeatedly attended the residence of a friend of the complainant. The complainant was **not** the affected party in the underlying incidents but was involved in contacting police on the friend's behalf.

According to the complainant, the first incident occurred in February 2024, when a man attended the friend's home, banged on their front window, and yelled at them. The complainant indicates that, "There was no action taken by police and the man disappeared."

The complainant indicates that on June 19, 2024, the same man returned and directed concerning behaviour toward the friend's children, which the complainant characterized as grooming behaviour. The friend and their husband attempted to obtain police assistance through both 911 and the non-emergency reporting line. The husband was allegedly told the matter was not an emergency, and responding officers later advised the friend that they could not take further action without a restraining order or peace bond.

The man reportedly returned again on June 19, 2024 and left a scooter, believed by the complainant to be stolen, on the front steps of the friend's house. The man reportedly stated that the scooter was for "his boys." The friend was fearful and reluctant to contact 911 due to their earlier interactions. The complainant subsequently contacted police on their behalf to update the existing report and to request that officers be dispatched. The dispatcher advised the complainant that police would be sent.

The complainant states that after approximately 80 minutes with no police arrival, they contacted the non-emergency line for an update, at which time they were informed that no officers had been dispatched in response to the earlier call. The complainant expressed that the discrepancy in information was distressing and unacceptable.

Ottawa Police Service Records

After completing a thorough review of the information provided by the OPS the following information was discovered.

On February 22, 2024 an unwanted male was observed looking into a residence located in the City of Ottawa. When the resident asked the individual to leave the property, he refused to do so. OPS was called by the resident. Officers attended the address, located the male, and issued a provincial trespass notice for failing to leave the premises when directed.

On June 19, 2024, the Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) transcript shows that multiple calls were made to OPS regarding an unwanted individual. These calls were placed by several parties, including the civilian involved, their husband, and the complainant. All calls were in relation to the same unwanted male party.

The CAD transcript revealed that on June 19, 2024, a civilian called 911 at 8:04 a.m. regarding an individual who rang the doorbell, asked the children their names and wrote troubling comments on the sidewalk with chalk.

A second call was made at 8:06 a.m. from the civilian's husband. They indicated that their wife had called police, and they wanted to ensure police would attend. They further noted that the unwanted individual was now in a laneway across the street.

The CAD revealed that the call was classified as a priority 3 and that an officer was dispatched at 8:20 a.m. and was on scene at 8:27 a.m.

A review of the audio recording from 911 confirmed that the complainant called 911 at 12:32 p.m. on June 19, 2024, on behalf of their neighbour. Additionally, they were informed that police would be dispatched.

The CAD transcript confirmed that the above noted call was made to 911 by the complainant at 12:32 p.m. indicating that the individual had returned to their neighbour's residence. The CAD transcript noted that the individual had left a scooter out front. The CAD further indicated the direction that the male was last seen walking.

The CAD shows that the original call was reopened / requeued for the original attending officer.

At 1:43 p.m. the CAD shows the call as being cleared to the attending officer for a report.

At 2:00 p.m. the CAD comments indicated that the complainant and their neighbour called 911 again and said that they were waiting for officers to reattend. The caller was advised that the call was cleared, and a report was submitted by an officer in the morning. The caller requested the police presence at their residence as the individual attended their residence again and dropped off a scooter. They reported that the individual indicated that the scooter was for “his boys”, he referred to the caller’s son as “his boy”. The CAD transcript revealed that the individual had left the premises.

A review of the audio recording from 911 confirmed that both the civilian and the complainant called on June 19, 2024, at 1:53 p.m. and indicated that the individual had returned to the residence. The call taker informed both parties that an officer was dispatched this morning, and a report has or will be made. She further explained that once the report is made it will be sent to an investigator for follow-up. If there are grounds for laying charges or identifying a suspect, a full investigation will be conducted. Additionally, the dispatcher informed both parties that every time they call 911 it is documented. The call taker gathered the necessary information and informed both parties that they would relay it to the officer that attended the call in the morning. The dispatcher explained that the matter would be sent for follow-up investigation and that since the male was gone an officer would not be sent at this time. The dispatcher indicated that the updated information would be passed along to the original attending officer.

At 2:03 p.m. the call taker informed the officer who cleared the call that the civilian called again and would like to speak with him as they were unhappy that police were not re-attending. Notes also indicate that the caller was under the impression that police would attend as officers told them to call back if the male returned.

The OPS Professional Standards Unit explained that the time recorded in the audio file reflects the moment the call taker pressed F1 to initiate the call for service. Any difference between the audio timestamp and the time recorded in the CAD is typically due to the conversation that occurs before the call taker decides to enter the call into the system. This clarification was provided because the complainant’s call was logged at 1:53 p.m. on the audio recording, while the CAD transcript listed the time as 2:00 p.m.

Occurrence Report June 19, 2024: Witness Officer 1

On June 19, 2024 at approximately 8:20 a.m., Witness Officer 1 was dispatched to a report of a suspicious circumstance. Information received was that a homeless man was hanging around and started talking to the civilian caller’s kids. Additional information was received that the male was ringing the complainant’s door and asked her kids what their names were.

Witness Officer 1 arrived on scene at approximately 8:27 a.m. and the unwanted male party had already left the premises. Witness Officer 1 spoke with the civilian caller. The civilian caller reported that the unwanted male had been lingering near their home in the morning while their husband was doing yard work. When the children came outside to go to school, the man spoke to them and asked their names. After the caller returned home from taking the children to school, they noticed chalk writing on the sidewalk that they found concerning. They expressed concern and noted that the same man had been at their residence in February 2024, which was reported to police. Witness Officer 1 completed a check of past incidents and located a call from February 22, 2024, where the male party was identified. Witness Officer 1 noted that the unwanted male was on the sex offender registry and indicated, "There is currently no evidence that [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] is for sure involved in today's incident. At this time there are no grounds that a criminal offense has taken place."

Occurrence Report June 19, 2024: Witness Officer 2:

On the evening of June 19, 2024 a Staff Sergeant completed a review of the original call for service and the additional details called in throughout the day. The Staff Sergeant subsequently created an administrative follow-up to have an officer attend and speak to the involved parties.

Witness Officer 2 was assigned to complete the follow-up and on June 19, 2024, at approximately 7:24 p.m., attended and spoke with the civilian. The civilian reported that an individual approached their two young children that morning and engaged them in conversation and play. They recognized the individual from incidents in February 2024.

The civilian reported that after their children left for school, the individual remained in the area and wrote several messages in chalk on both the sidewalk in front of the residence and on their front porch. The officer observed these messages, which included "I still dream of life with your family," a heart symbol, "Thank you," and "Lorene is love." The civilian stated that the individual rang their doorbell multiple times, looked into their home through a window, and then entered a residence across the street. They also reported that the individual returned later in the day and left a child's scooter at their front steps.

During the interaction, Witness Officer 2 noted that the civilian appeared frightened and expressed concern for their safety and that of their children. They advised that they had previously attempted to obtain a peace bond but were unsuccessful due to the lack of a confirmed address for the individual.

Witness Officer 2 reviewed police records and confirmed that the same individual, previously identified by police during the February incidents, had been issued a trespass notice for failing to leave the property when directed. The officer compared a recent mugshot and identifying features to the photograph provided by the civilian and was satisfied with the subject's identification.

Witness Officer 2 obtained a written statement from the civilian, documenting the events of both the February incidents and the events earlier in the day, including their account that the subject had repeatedly stated, "They're my children" during both encounters. They stated that they believed the individual was fixated on their children and feared for their family's safety.

Based on the information obtained, the officer formed reasonable grounds to lay charges of mischief – interfere with lawful enjoyment of property, criminal harassment by repeated communications, and breach of probation – failing to keep the peace and be of good behaviour. The civilian was advised to call police again if the individual returned.

Witness Officer 2 contacted property management for the building across the street and confirmed that the individual was not listed as a tenant. Witness Officer 2 further canvassed the building but was unable to locate the male party.

The civilian subsequently provided photographs of the individual, the scooter, and the chalk messages, along with a copy of their previously denied peace bond application. These items were added to the investigative file. Witness Officer 2 completed the required documentation and indicated an intention to seek a warrant after additional attempts to locate the male subject.

An email was sent to the OPS distribution list advising of grounds to arrest the involved male party.

Occurrence Report June 20, 2024, Witness Officer 3:

On the morning of June 20, 2024, Witness Officer 3 noted the email indicating reasonable and probable grounds for the arrest of the male party. Witness Officer 3 then parked near the address to review the file, including a photo and description of the male party. At 9:02 a.m. Witness Officer 3 located and arrested the male, who was held for a show cause bail hearing.

Ottawa Police Service Procedure

The OPS Communications/Dispatch Policy No: 2:01 was reviewed. Attached to this procedure is Appendix “A” Call Response Protocol, which outlines the criteria to determine the priority of a call, definitions of types of calls, goals, and objectives for each priority.

As the complainant’s call was categorized a priority 3, the call response protocol for priority 3 calls was reviewed. The definition for a priority 3 is incidents in which there is a reasonable belief that an extended delay in response may place persons, property or evidence at risk. Definition: Criminal Code offense in progress or Apparent risk of injuries

The goal is a response time of 30 minutes, 90% of the time. The objective is to ensure appropriate and timely response to all priority 3 calls. To ensure appropriate and timely response to all Priority 3 calls, Priority 3 calls shall be voice dispatched and call sent to Mobile Workstation. Officers from “adjacent zones” regardless of division may be used or pre-empted. Should all attempts to dispatch officers be unsuccessful within the 30-minute goal, the dispatcher will first advise the assigned field supervisor assigned to the zone of the incident or, if unsuccessful, have the Communications Supervisor/Manager consult with the divisional patrol Staff Sergeant (or designate) to have the call assessed and addressed. The divisional patrol Staff Sergeant (or designate) where the call originated will have the final responsibility to manage patrol resources which includes alternate call response.

The Dispatch Matrix in the Call Response Protocol provides a quick reference for each priority call and describes the criteria for each priority, the response time for each priority and the backup location for each priority call. The back up location for a priority 3 call is anyone close to the zone.

The Duty Roster for June 19, 2024, was reviewed. The document revealed there were [redacted – s 1(1)1 – O Reg 317/24].

The queued calls in pending for June 19, 2024 was reviewed. At the time of complainant’s call at 8:04 a.m., there were 6 calls. There were three priority 3 and three priority 4 calls. For clarity, priority 3 calls are higher urgency to address than priority 4 calls. Additionally, if a higher priority call came in after the complainant’s call, that would further delay the response to the priority 3.

OPS Patrol Directorate Standard Operating Procedures Policy #3.17-1 was reviewed. This policy is currently under review due to the CSPA coming into force in April 2024. The purpose of the procedure is to provide related expectations on a number of factors impacting effective resource management for Frontline Platoon and Fixed Shift Operations.

The policy outlines general staffing levels, unit complements, sector and city-wide staffing, time off and deployment to name a few.

Within this policy, the Recommended Sector Staffing Table 2019 was reviewed, and it outlines the minimum cars per shift. [redacted – s 1(1)1 – O Reg 317/24].

Ottawa Police Service Call-taker / Dispatcher Training

When an individual is hired within the Communications Centre at the OPS, they are placed in-class for the start of their training for five weeks. Within the in-class portion, new members are exposed to the roles and responsibilities of a call taker and dispatcher, as well as the provincial adequacy standards, as directed by the Ministry of the Solicitor General. A sample of other topics covered include: 911 Tiered Response, Liabilities & Ethics, Wellness and Ergonomics, OPS Boundaries, Call Response Protocols, Dispatch Matrix, Policies and Procedures, Call Paths, Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) training, Canadian Police Information Centre (CPIC) training, Suspect Apprehension Pursuit (SAP) training, Frontline Ride-Along, as well as various online courses through the Canadian Police Knowledge Network (CPKN).

Once the in-class portion has been completed, the member is paired with a trainer for on the phone training. New members are trained on answering 911 calls as well as the non-emergency line for the OPS. After approximately 350-400 hours of training, the member is “released” and works independently from their trainer. After a couple of months, the member gets paired with a trainer to begin dispatch training. The dispatch training is hands on and not done in a classroom style. Typically, a member trains on dispatch for another 2-3 months before being fully released.

In addition, there are mandatory courses required throughout communications staff members’ careers. A sample of ongoing training includes, Cultural Awareness and Humility, Accessible Customer Service in a Policing Environment, Bill 168 Occupational Health and Safety, Active Bystander in Law Enforcement (ABLE), Anti-Black racism, and many more. Generally, the Chief of Police will issue orders on mandatory training that OPS members are required to complete.

During the in-class portion of training, approximately three days are dedicated to reviewing, learning, and understanding all policies and procedures, including the Sectional Operating Procedure (SOP) for “Suspicious Circumstances” and “Trespass/Remove”. For dispatching, dispatchers must adhere to the Call Response Protocol. This protocol is introduced during in-class training as part of the training curriculum and is subsequently reviewed again during dispatch training phase.

Involved Call-taker / Dispatcher Training Status

There were a total of four (4) call takers involved throughout the course of this incident. The call takers for this incident have between 8 and 24 years of service and experience. The dispatcher for this incident has 13 years of service with the OPS. All individuals involved are current with their mandatory training and have completed all required ongoing training updates.

The type of call for service in this incident was covered in the training curriculum for all involved staff members.

INVESTIGATION FINDINGS

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

1) The Ottawa Police Service received a call regarding an unwanted individual at a residence on June 19, 2024. The call was deemed a priority three.

- a) On June 19, 2024, at 8:04 a.m. a call was made to 911 by a civilian regarding an unwanted individual at their residence and was classified by the call taker as a priority three.
- b) The CAD transcript shows that at 8:06 a.m. a second call was made to 911. The call was to confirm if police were attending.
- c) The CAD transcript shows that the call was classified as a priority 3 and that an officer was dispatched at 8:20 a.m. and on scene at 8:27 a.m.
- d) At 8:58 a.m. the CAD indicates that the officer was in service.
- e) At 12:32 p.m. the CAD shows that a third call was made to 911 by the complainant indicating that the individual had returned to the address.

- f) According to OPS's call response protocol, the goal for a priority 3 call is a response time of 30 minutes, 90% of the time.

2) The Ottawa Police Service Occurrence Report outlines the response to the call regarding an unwanted individual at a residence on June 19, 2024.

- a) At approximately 8:20 a.m., Witness Officer 1 was dispatched to a report of a suspicious circumstance.
- b) Witness Officer 1 arrived on scene at approximately 8:27 a.m.
- c) Witness Officer 1 noted that the individual believed to be involved is on the sex offender registry, but he was no longer present, and it was not definitively confirmed that he was involved in today's incident.
- d) Witness Officer 1 indicated that at this time there are no grounds that a criminal offense has taken place.
- e) At 12:24 p.m., the individual returned and left a Hot Wheels children's scooter beside the front porch.

3) The complainant called 911 on June 19, 2024, at 12:32 p.m. on behalf of their neighbour. The complainant was also present when their neighbour called at 1:53 p.m. This information was added to the original call for service and police did not immediately attend in response to these subsequent calls.

- a) Audio recording confirmed that the complainant called 911 at 12:32 p.m. on June 19, 2024 and indicated that the male returned and left a scooter out front
- b) Audio recording confirmed that the complainant and their neighbour called 911 at 1:53 p.m. on June 19, 2024. They advised that they were waiting for officers to attend.
- c) The call taker informed both parties that an officer was dispatched this morning, and a report has or will be made.

- d) The call taker explained that once the report is made it will be sent to an investigator to follow-up and that way if there are any charges to be laid or to identify the person an investigation will be completed.
- e) The call taker informed both parties that all calls to 911 are documented.
- f) The call taker gathered the necessary information and informed both parties that they would relay it to the officer that attended the call in the morning.
- g) The caller requested police presence as the individual attended their residence again and dropped off a scooter.
- h) At 2:01 p.m. the CAD transcript showed that the individual left the premises.
- i) The CAD transcript shows that at 2:03 p.m. the dispatcher informed the officer who cleared the call that the civilian caller called again and would like to speak with him as they were unhappy that police were not re-attending.

4) On the evening of June 19, 2024 a Staff Sergeant completed a review of the original call for service and the additional details called in throughout the day. The Staff Sergeant subsequently created an administrative follow-up to have an officer attend and speak to the involved parties.

- a) Witness Officer 2 was assigned to follow-up on the evening of June 19, 2024 and arrived at 7:24 p.m.
- b) Witness Officer 2 noted that after speaking with the civilian, and reviewing their written statement, there was sufficient reasonable grounds to charge the accused with mischief – interfere with lawful enjoyment of property, criminal harassment by repeated communications, and breach of probation – failing to keep the peace and be of good behaviour. Witness Officer 2 remained on scene, but the individual did not return to the residence.
- c) While patrolling the area on the morning of June 20, 2024, Witness Officer 3 arrested the accused on reasonable and probable grounds at 9:02 a.m.
- d) The accused was held for a show cause bail hearing.

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