Inspectorate of Policing

Decision Regarding Findings Report INV-24-27 Concerning Policing Provided by the Toronto Police Service

Decision By:
Joseph Maiorano, Deputy Inspector General of Policing

I. INTRODUCTION

[1] This decision addresses a complaint received by the Inspector General of Policing against the Toronto Police Service ("TPS"), alleging that the TPS failed to dispatch police officers to respond to a noise complaint from a neighbouring property. An inspector with Ontario's Inspectorate of Policing ("IoP") investigated the complaint to determine whether the Toronto Police Service 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 TPS has not failed to comply with the Act and the regulations.

II. BACKGROUND

[3] I adopt the facts as found by the inspector and outlined in the Findings Report.

[4] On June 15, 2024, the complainant contacted TPS to report that his neighbour was hosting a loud party with ten attendees and that he did not feel safe. Although a police officer was initially dispatched, the TPS call-taker quickly determined from TPS records that the complainant was a "chronic caller" and the dispatched officer was cancelled. The Toronto Community Housing Corporation ("TCHC") was notified of the call and the fact that police would not be attending.

[5] TPS attempted to contact the complainant several times over the following ten minutes, ultimately leaving a voicemail instructing the complainant to call 311. Nevertheless, the complainant called back several times, before being cautioned regarding multiple unfounded 911 calls.

III. ISSUES

[6] The issue raised is whether the TPS decision to not dispatch police officers to the complainant's calls constituted a failure to provide adequate and effective policing.

[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.

IV. ANALYSIS

[7] The inspection conducted a detailed review of the computer-aided dispatch ("CAD") records related to the complainant's calls to police, as well as the TPS policies and procedures relating to the intake of calls for service and the dispatch of police thereto.

[8] Pursuant to subsection 15(3) of the *Adequate and Effective Policing (General)* regulation, O Reg 392/23 (the "Regulation"),[2] the TPS has established a "Non-Emergency Primary Report Intake" policy. It sets outs the procedure by which the TPS Primary Report Intake Management and Entry Unit and the Primary Response Units provide effective, efficient alternate methods of response to non-emergency calls for service.

[9] The policy requires a call-taker to assess, from the outset, whether a call for service meets the listed non-emergency criteria. Where it does not, a CAD event is created and a police officer dispatched. The policy also dictates the methods in which a non-emergency call for service will be addressed.

[10] In this matter, the TPS followed the dictates of its policy. The first call for service was assessed according to the policy's non-emergency criteria and found, instead, to require an immediate police response. A police officer was dispatched. A continuing review of the circumstances, however, quickly led to a reassessment and the police response was cancelled.

[11] The TPS immediately attempted to call the complainant back and explain the new decision. A voicemail with the appropriate information was left when the TPS could not reach the complainant. When the complainant called back, the TPS provided a full explanation for their decision. Finally, at every stage, the TPS properly documented the calls, responses and explanations to permit an appropriate review.

[2] Enacted pursuant to the Act.

V. CONCLUSION

[12] Further to their statutory obligations, the TPS developed a policy to address the receipt of non-emergency calls-for-service. The policy included reasonable criteria for assessing the status of and response to such calls. Here, that policy was implemented. Information from the initial call dictated an immediate dispatch, which was subsequently recalled as additional information was received and evaluated. The TPS then properly attempted to notify the complainant of the change in response.

[13] Ultimately, the TPS decision to characterize the complainant as a "chronic caller" under the circumstances and terminate the police dispatch response was reasonable, and satisfied the requirements of the Act to provide adequate and effective policing.

Date: October 29, 2026

Original Signed By

_____

Joseph Maiorano
Deputy Inspector General of Policing

Inspectorate of Policing

FINDINGS REPORT

Toronto Police Service

Section 107(1)(a) Policing Complaint Investigation
(INV-24-27)

Submitted to:
Ryan Teschner
Inspector General of Policing of Ontario

October 1, 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
Police Service Data Collection and Analysis 5
INVESTIGATION FINDINGS 8

ABOUT THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICING AND THE INSPECTORATE OF POLICING

The Inspector General of Policing drives improved performance and accountability in policing and police governance by overseeing the delivery of adequate and effective policing across Ontario. The Inspector General ensures compliance with the province's policing legislation and standards, and has the authority to issue progressive, risk-based and binding directions and measures to protect public safety. Ontario's Community Safety and Policing Act embeds protections to ensure the Inspector General's statutory duty is delivered independently from government.

The Inspector General of Policing leads the Inspectorate of Policing (IoP). The IoP provides operational support to inspect, investigate, monitor, and advise Ontario's police services, boards and special constable employers. By leveraging independent research and data intelligence, the IoP promotes leading practices and identifies areas for improvement, ensuring that high-quality policing and police governance is delivered to make everyone in Ontario safer.

In March 2023, Ryan Teschner was appointed as Ontario's first Inspector General of Policing with duties and authorities under the Community Safety and Policing Act. Mr. Teschner is a recognized expert in public administration, policing and police governance.

For more information about the Inspector General of Policing or the IoP, please visit www.iopontario.ca.

INTRODUCTION

This is a report to the Inspector General of Policing by an inspector appointed by the Inspector General, who has completed an inspection under Part VII of the *Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019* (CSPA).

OVERVIEW OF INVESTIGATION

The Complaint

A written complaint was received by the Inspector General of Policing alleging that the Toronto Police Service (TPS) failed to provide adequate and effective policing. The complainant claims that TPS did not dispatch officers in response to their call to the non-emergency line seeking assistance with a noise complaint from a neighboring property.

The Subject Police Service

Name of Police Service: Toronto Police Service
Service Headquarters: 40 College St, Toronto, ON, M5G 2J3
Chief of Police: Myron Demkiw
Chief of Police since December 2022

Service Total Strength: (Actual & Authorized)

- **Number of sworn members:**
  Actual: 5542 (as of June 25, 2025)
  Authorized: 5340
- **Number of civilian members:**
  Actual: 2665 (as of June 25, 2025)
  Authorized: 2587

Geographic Service Area

- Total area covered: Approximately 635.3 square kilometres
- Population served: Approximately 3,179,255

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.

The following regulation was reviewed having regard to the allegations made in the complaint:

Ontario Regulation 392/23: Adequate and Effective Policing (General)

SUMMARY OF THE INVESTIGATION CONDUCTED

Police Service Data Collection and Analysis

A review of the Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) records indicates that on June 15, 2024, the complainant contacted the TPS multiple times regarding a noise complaint. At 12:15 p.m., the complainant called and reported that his neighbor was hosting a loud party with approximately ten attendees and stated that he did not feel safe. He informed the call taker that he had previously contacted municipal by-law services and was directed to call TPS. Although an officer was initially dispatched at 12:23 p.m., the CAD transcript records that the dispatch supervisor identified the complainant as a chronic caller and determined that TPS would not attend the incident at the Toronto Community Housing Corporation (TCHC). The event was subsequently closed. At 12:28 p.m., a call was placed to TCHC to inform them that TPS would not be attending.

On June 15, 2024, at 12:23 p.m. the complainant made an online request for police to attend the matter. In his online request, the complainant indicated that his neighbor was blasting loud party music and to “please bring by-law as well to give them a ticket for breaking the noise by-law thank you and fine them, please”. The complainant identified the incident location type as a common parking area.

At 12:24 p.m. the CAD transcript revealed that the matter was not a parking complaint but a noise complaint. At 12:30 p.m. the CAD transcript indicates that staff from TPS would complete a “call back” to the complainant. A call was made to the complainant at 12:30 p.m., to which there was no response. The call taker noted that two attempts to call the complainant were made at 12:30 p.m. and at 12:31 p.m. but he did not answer. A third attempt was made to call the complainant at 12:39 p.m., with no response. A voicemail was left instructing the complainant to call 311 regarding his complaint.

At 12:40 p.m., the complainant called back and was advised to call 311 with his complaint. At 12:41 p.m., the complainant initially stated that there was no party but later informed the call taker that an ongoing party was in fact taking place. In his online report, the complainant noted that his neighbour was blasting music and violating the noise bylaw. The dispatcher then noted that they were unsure if it was a noisy party, or if the complainant was attempting to have police attend. At 12:41 p.m., the event type changed from PRIPA (Private Parking Complaint) to NOIPA (Noisy Party). The complainant informed the call taker at 12:41 p.m. that multiple people were in attendance and, at 12:42 p.m., the CAD was updated to reflect the information provided by the complainant.

The CAD transcript revealed that at 12:43 p.m. the call taker completed a review of the multiple calls made by the complainant on June 14 and 15, 2024 and he was then cautioned regarding unfounded and multiple calls to 911.

The CAD transcript indicated that the supervisor noted at 1:09 p.m. that the “same emotionally disturb person (EDP)” called and that the TPS would not be attending the TCHC. The supervisor noted that the TCHC was advised per previous call that police were not attending.

The CAD transcript notes that a disposition was made “Advised or Referral” as they contacted the TCHC and informed them that TPS would not be attending, the event was closed, and the Mobile Data Terminal (MDT) was updated to reflect the information that was gathered by the call taker and supervisor.

The Non-Emergency Primary Report Intake policy and procedure was reviewed which addressed the Primary Report Intake Management and Entry (PRIME) Unit. PRIME is a dedicated unit that provides the public with telephone and online response to non-emergency and administrative calls for service. The mandate of PRIME is to work in conjunction with Primary Response Units (PRU) and provide effective, efficient, alternative and supplemental methods of response to those calls for service where the attendance of the police may not be immediately necessary.

The document includes a list of criteria for PRIME / Non-Emergency Response. The list of criteria includes incidents:

- that do not require immediate PRU attendance
- where it appears there is no potential for imminent danger or escalating violence
- that are not domestic related
- that do not involve persons in crisis
- that do not require a lengthy on scene investigation
- where an immediate arrest is unlikely
- where the suspect has left the scene and is unlikely to return, whether they are known or not known
- where no further investigation is warranted but an eReport is required for administrative purposes

When a call for service for a non-emergency incident is received at Communications, the call taker assesses the situation to determine whether the event satisfies the criteria for non-emergency response. If so, a CAD event is created and assigned to PRIME for telephone response.

If circumstances change during the telephone/online investigation, an event will be created for PRU response appropriate to the priority level of the incident. If the initial call for service does not satisfy the non-emergency criteria, a CAD event is created and assigned to the appropriate dispatch desk for PRU response.

The policy also provides insight into the available disposition when response to calls for service meets the PRIME criteria. As per the policy, the disposition will be delivered by one of the following methods:

- refer the complainant to an alternate internal or external service provider by providing the relevant contact information and, if possible, putting the complainant in direct contact with that service provider
- provide simple advice over the telephone – no eReport required, call disposition is cleared by “ADVISED”

The policy explains that under no circumstances shall a member of the public be inconvenienced. If a service response must be delayed, a full explanation for the delay shall be given to the complainant.

The TCHC website was reviewed. The Community Safety Unit's (CSU) mandate is to foster community well-being and safety by working together for safer communities. The CSU provides 24/7 community engagement and support, call response, delivers safety programs for tenants and staff, assists victims of crime, apprehends offenders, liaises with internal and external stakeholders, builds relationships with communities and works in partnership with law enforcement agencies including the TPS.

In 2021, the CSU launched a pilot program to provide additional support to TCHC tenants and staff through an Alternate Response Unit. This program was launched to alleviate low-priority calls that can be resolved via telephone or email from frontline CSU staff. This program also provides tenants and staff with increased services as non-emergency calls can be addressed without CSU staff being re-directed to higher priority calls for service.

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 Toronto Police Service responded to a noise complaint made by the complainant on June 15, 2024.**

    a) June 15, 2024, at 12:15 p.m., the complainant called TPS indicating that his neighbor was having a party with extremely loud music and around ten people were in attendance.

    b) The complainant informed the call taker that he had previously called by-law and was instructed to call TPS.

    c) An officer was dispatched at 12:23 p.m. to attend to the matter.

    d) At 12:23 p.m., the CAD transcript indicated that the complainant was a chronic caller, and that TPS would not attend TCHC. The event was closed at 12:23 p.m.

    e) At 12:28 p.m., the CAD transcript indicated that a call was made to TCHC to advise that the TPS would not be attending.

    f) On June 15, 2024, at 12:23 p.m., the complainant made an online request for police to attend the matter.

g) At 12:39 p.m., a voicemail message was left for the complainant with an instruction to contact 311 regarding his noise complaint.

h) At 12:41 p.m. the complainant initially stated that there was no party but later informed the call taker that an ongoing party was in fact taking place. In his online report, the complainant noted that his neighbor was blasting music and violating the noise bylaw.

i) At 12:42 p.m., the CAD was updated to reflect the information provided by the complainant.

j) The CAD transcript indicated that, at 12:43 p.m., the complainant was cautioned regarding multiple calls regarding noise complaints which were unfounded.

k) At 1:09 p.m., a supervisor noted that “same emotionally disturb person (EDP)” called and indicated that TPS were not attending the TCHC.

l) The CAD transcript demonstrated that several reviews were completed by the call takers as the complainant had contacted TPS on several occasions. The supervisor noted that the TCHC was advised on a previous call that police were not attending.

m) A further review was completed again at 1:15 p.m. by the call taker and a unit was assigned at 1:28 p.m.

n) The CAD transcript reveals that a disposition was made “Advised or Referral” and the event was closed at 2:07 p.m. as they contacted the TCHC and informed them that TPS would not be attending.

o) As per the Non-Emergency Primary Report Intake policy, a CAD event was created as it was determined that the online request for service satisfied the criteria for non-emergency response. Therefore, it was assigned to the PRIME for a telephone response.

Inspectorate of Policing

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