Inspectorate of Policing

Decision Regarding Findings Report INV-25-19 Concerning Policing Provided by the Ontario Provincial Police – Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry Detachment

Decision By:
Ryan Teschner, Inspector General of Policing

I. INTRODUCTION

[1] This decision addresses a complaint received by the Inspector General of Policing concerning the Ontario Provincial Police – Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry Detachment (the "OPP"), alleging that police refused to address his trespassing complaint. An inspector with Ontario's Inspectorate of Policing ("IoP") investigated the complaint to determine whether the OPP 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 OPP has complied with the Act and the regulations, and delivered adequate and effective policing.

II. BACKGROUND

[3] The complainant first contacted the OPP on June 14, 2024, and again on June 20, 2024, concerning an alleged trespass violation on a campground.

[4] The first call-for-service on June 14, 2024 was assigned a Priority 4 by the communications dispatcher. The attending officer spoke with both the complainant and the alleged trespasser, documenting the provided details in an occurrence report. Thereafter, the officer contacted the area by-law officer, who viewed this as a civil matter, not a by-law matter. The OPP officer ultimately advised the complainant to direct further complaints to the campground board/committee.

[5] The complainant's second call-for-service, made on June 20, 2024 at 10:25 a.m., was also assigned a Priority 4. The OPP detachment's Daily Summary Report recorded a total of 73 calls-for-service in the 12-hour period in which the complainant's call was made. Consequently, other higher-priority calls delayed the OPP response to the complainant. Nevertheless, a responding officer was eventually dispatched at 3:19 p.m. The attending officer attempted to reach the complainant by telephone, failed, and left a voicemail message. The officer did not receive a return call and the call was eventually cleared at 7:34 p.m.

[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.

III. ISSUES

[6] Did the OPP's response fail to comply with the Act's requirement to deliver adequate and effective policing?

IV. ANALYSIS

[7] These incidents illustrate the challenge facing police services in Ontario, as they attempt to balance timely and effective responses to life and death situations with matters of a less emergent nature or matters that may not even necessitate a police response.

[8] As revealed in the Findings Report, the OPP's Standard Operating Procedure describes Priority 4 calls as those that require police attention, but not necessarily an in-person response by a police officer. Accordingly, Priority 4 calls-for-service may be properly responded to by an officer contacting the complainant by telephone. The response time for a Priority 4 call is described "as workload permits."

[9] In the first call, an OPP officer attended and conducted an investigation that included speaking with the complainant, the alleged trespasser and the local by-law officer. The OPP officer determined that the matter was either a by-law or civil matter, which did not require any additional police involvement at that time. Finally, the OPP officer "closed the loop" by contacting the complainant again and canvassing the civil remedies available to the complainant.

[10] In the second call, an OPP officer was dispatched when there was a reasonable opportunity, given other higher-priority calls-for-service. The responding officer attempted to contact the complainant by telephone (as OPP Policy permits), left a message, but the call was not returned. In my view, the delivery of adequate and effective policing does not require further investigative steps to respond to calls of this nature and in these circumstances.

[11] There was no threat to public safety in this case. After his first call, the complainant was provided with an alternative avenue to address his concern, which he apparently chose not to pursue.

[12] Instead, the complainant contacted the OPP again mere days later with the same complaint, and more police resources were required to be assigned, only to determine that the OPP were being contacted by the same person about the same issue. It is unfortunate that the complainant did not return the OPP officer's call and provide the information that may have been requested. The time taken to evaluate the call-for-service, dispatch the call, contact the complainant, and then document the circumstances and close out the call is all precious time that could have been applied to more urgent policing matters.

[13] The OPP not only responded reasonably, but I want to commend the OPP for triaging these calls appropriately, given the lack of public safety threat, and for following their internal policy in determining how best to respond to a call of this nature.

V. CONCLUSION

[14] The OPP's handling of the complainant's calls-for-service, both in terms of the call-taking, dispatch and investigative actions were in compliance with the Act and its regulations.

Date: October 29, 2026

Original Signed By

Ryan Teschner
Inspector General of Policing

Inspectorate of Policing

FINDINGS REPORT

Ontario Provincial Police – Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry Detachment

Section 107(1)(a) Policing Complaint Investigation
(INV-25-19)

Submitted to:
Ryan Teschner
Inspector General of Policing of Ontario

November 7, 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABOUT THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICING AND THE INSPECTORATE OF POLICING 3

INTRODUCTION 3

OVERVIEW OF INVESTIGATION 4

- The Complaint 4
- The Subject Police Service 4
- Applicable Legislative and Regulatory Provisions 5

SUMMARY OF THE INVESTIGATION CONDUCTED 5

- O.P.P. Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) – June 14, 2024 5
- O.P.P. Occurrence Report 6
- O.P.P. Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) – June 20, 2024 7
- O.P.P. Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) – July 15, 2024 7
- Call Priority Classification 8
- Campground Website Review 8

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 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 complaint alleged that the Ontario Provincial Police (O.P.P.) refused to respond to a call made on June 16, 2024, regarding no trespassing signs after a vandalism incident in a campground.

The complainant indicated that he filed a complaint with his local OPP Detachment regarding no trespassing signs that were placed at the edge of his campground property after a vandalism incident. Despite visiting the local detachment to speak with an officer and making several calls for assistance, he did not receive a response to his complaint. Additionally, he stated that an officer reached out to the Board of Directors of the campground, however he claims that the information relayed was not accurate. The complainant claims to have been assured that he would be contacted by an officer. At the time of the complaint, he indicated that he had not been contacted.

The Subject Police Service

Name of Police Service: Ontario Provincial Police – Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry Detachment
Detachment Address: 4 Mille Roche Road, Long Sault, ON K0C 1P0
Detachment Commander: Inspector Marc Hemmerick (in position for 4 years)
Detachment Total Strength: (Actual & Authorized)

- Sworn - 148-Actual
- Civilian - 16-Actual

Geographic Service Area

- 3250 Square Kilometers
- Community Population of approximately 65,000 year-round residents, which increases from May to October due to summer residents and tourism. The six municipalities have several built-up communities within them and include Alexandria (pop. 3.300), Winchester (pop. 2,700) and Morrisburg (pop 2,200)

Applicable Legislative and Regulatory Provisions

Section 11(1) of the CSPA provides that adequate and effective policing means all of the following functions provided in accordance with the standards set out in the regulations, including the standards with respect to the avoidance of conflicts of interest, and with the requirements of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* and the *Human Rights Code*:

1. Crime prevention.
2. Law enforcement.
3. Maintaining the public peace.
4. Emergency response.
5. Assistance to victims of crime.
6. Any other prescribed policing functions.

Ontario Regulation 392/23: ADEQUATE AND EFFECTIVE POLICING (GENERAL) was reviewed having regard to the allegations made in the complaint.

SUMMARY OF THE INVESTIGATION CONDUCTED

O.P.P. Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) – June 14, 2024

After completing a thorough review of the documentation provided by the Ontario Provincial Police (O.P.P.), the following information was discovered.

The Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) revealed that on June 14, 2024, at 1:40 p.m. the complainant was outside the O.P.P. Morrisburg detachment to make a complaint regarding a trespassing matter. The CAD transcript revealed that the complainant indicated that it was an ongoing issue. The call taker noted that the location is vacant land and there were no trespassing signs up. The complainant informed the call taker that the parties continue to go onto the caller's property as well as vacant land. The complainant indicated that the trespasser is a male and female from another camping lot. The call taker gathered further information and the complainant was instructed to wait at the detachment. The call was deemed a priority 4 and was broadcast at 1:43 p.m. At 3:20 p.m. the CAD transcript reveals that the complainant reported issues with access/egress rules at the campground to Witness Officer 1. Additionally, Witness Officer 1 indicated that follow-up with the park committee and area by-law enforcement would be completed. At 3:23 p.m. the CAD transcript revealed that the call for service was cleared by Witness Officer 1 for a report.

O.P.P. Occurrence Report

On June 14th, 2024, the complainant attended the OPP Morrisburg Detachment to report an issue he was having at the campground where he resides.

The complainant indicated that his neighbour [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] is utilizing an alternate route to access her lot at the campground. He noted that two other individuals own the vacant land to the north of the campground, which his neighbour is utilizing with their permission.

The complainant explained that after several campers were vandalized, a security committee was formed to regulate access at the campground. Measures were put in place to ensure that vehicles accessing the campground had to use the main entrance, and items/rocks were placed in areas to prevent access anywhere else.

The complainant mentioned that his neighbour [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] continued to enter and exit through a different route. The complainant felt like others were following suit and using this route.

The complainant was worried that others, including non-campground members would be able to trespass by utilizing this route.

The complainant explained several times that there are no trespassing signs along the campground, and his neighbour would not be trespassing as she is a member of the campground.

Witness Officer 1 contacted the campground by e-mail, highlighting the concern, and requesting more information about the potential trespassing. [Redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] replied and explained that the only persons utilizing the alternative access route are two authorized individuals, she added that the campground board had not received any complaints from owners about this.

Witness Officer 1 also contacted the area by-law officer, who advised that this is a civil, not a by-law matter.

Since the occurrence date, the complainant has made one further trespassing complaint to police.

The complainant was advised to direct further complaints to the campground board/committee before involving police.

O.P.P. Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) – June 20, 2024

On June 20, 2024, the CAD transcript reveals that the complainant called the O.P.P. at 10:25 a.m. indicating that there were ongoing issues with people trespassing on his property which was previously reported on June 14, 2024. The call taker deemed the call as a priority 4.
The complainant requested that officers attend because he had found fresh vehicle tracks from the property next door. The complainant indicated that it must have occurred overnight by an unknown suspect.

The CAD indicated that the zone unit was to be advised.

At 3:19 p.m. the CAD transcript shows that a message was left by Witness Officer 2 for the complainant requesting that he return the call to police.

At 7:34 p.m. the call was cleared for a report. The clearing indicated that Witness officer 2 left a message for the complainant to return the call to police.

The Daily Summary Report was reviewed for June 20, 2024, and revealed that on that day between 6:00 am and 6:00 pm the O.P.P. detachment received 73 calls for service including the complainant's call at 10:25 a.m.

Further review of officer notes and information provided by the O.P.P. indicates that due to the high call volume and the low-priority nature of this call, it appears the matter was held until an officer became available to respond. Witness Officer 2 was assigned to high-priority service calls and mandatory court appearances throughout the day and was dispatched to the complainant's call at 3:19 p.m. Witness Officer 2 called the complainant and left a voicemail message requesting a call back but did not speak to the complainant directly.

O.P.P. Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) – July 15, 2024

On July 15, 2024, the CAD transcript reveals that the complainant was outside the Winchester detachment 8:02 a.m. and had some documents that he needed an officer to sign. The call taker deemed the call a priority 4.

At 9:11 a.m. the CAD additional notes revealed that the complainant attended the police station as he needed to have an officer sign his LECA complaint form. The complainant indicated that attempts were made to resolve the issue at a local level. The complainant stated that he had tried numerous times with calls made to the local police and it was "without any luck." Witness Officer 3 signed and faxed the complaint document to LECA.

Call Priority Classification

The Provincial Communication Centre Standard Operating Procedures were reviewed.

A Priority 4 is defined as an event that requires police attention but not necessarily their presence such as:

- an occurrence where contacting the complainant can be done on the telephone; or
- the service of the OPP or member attendance is not required but is for information purposes only.

The response time for a priority 4 is as workload permits.

Campground Website Review

A review of the campground's website revealed that the Board of Directors and Officers consists of five members. Additionally, the website includes a section where individuals can file a complaint by filling out an online form.

INVESTIGATION FINDINGS

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

1. **The complainant attended the Morrisburg O.P.P. detachment on June 14, 2024, and spoke with an officer regarding his concerns about a trespassing matter.**

    a) Information provided by the O.P.P. in the CAD confirms that the complainant did attend the O.P.P detachment to file a complaint.
    b) The CAD revealed that the call was deemed a priority 4.
    c) The complainant did speak with an officer who completed an Occurrence Report.
    d) The Occurrence Report reveals that Witness Officer 1 spoke with the area by-law enforcement who advised that this is a civil, not a by-law matter.
    e) Witness Officer 1 contacted the campground by e-mail, highlighting the concern, and requesting more information about the potential trespassing.

f) Witness Officer 1 received information from a member of the campground board [redacted – s 1(1)2 – O Reg 317/24] explaining that the only persons utilizing the alternative access route are two authorized individuals. She added that the campground board had not received any complaints from owners about this.
g) Witness officer 1 informed the complainant to direct further complaints to the campground board before involving police.

2. The complainant called the O.P.P. on June 20, 2024, regarding his concerns about trespassing.

a) The CAD reveals that a call was made to O.P.P. at 10:25 a.m. by the complainant regarding concerns of trespassing.
b) The CAD revealed that the call was deemed a priority 4.
c) From the information received by O.P.P. due to the high volume of calls an officer was not able to address the matter until 3:19 p.m.
d) Witness officer 2 left a voice message for the complainant to return call to police.
e) There is no information to indicate that the Officer spoke directly with the complainant regarding this matter; however, a voicemail was left requesting the complainant to return the call.

3. The complainant attended the Winchester O.P.P. detachment on July 15, 2024, wanting an officer to sign his LECA complaint form.

a) On July 15, 2024, the CAD transcript reveals that the complainant was outside the detachment 8:02 a.m. and had some documents that he needed an officer to sign.
b) The call taker deemed the call a priority 4.
c) At 9:11 a.m. the CAD transcript reveals that Witness Officer 3 signed and faxed the complaint document to LECA.

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