

Report to / Rapport a:

**OTTAWA POLICE SERVICE BOARD
LA COMMISSION DE SERVICE DE POLICE D'OTTAWA**

27 April 2026 / 27 avril 2026

Submitted by / Soumis par:

Chief of Police, Ottawa Police Service / Chef de police, Service de police d'Ottawa

Contact Person / Personne ressource:

Superintendent Mazen Dikah, Executive Officer to the Chief of Police

Commissaire de police / Fonctionnaire exécutif

DikahM@ottawapolice.ca

SUBJECT: COMPLAINTS REPORT – POLICE SERVICES ACT, COMMUNITY SAFETY AND POLICING ACT AND SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS UNIT ACT: FIRST QUARTER 2026

OBJET: RAPPORT SUR LES PLAINTES – LOI SUR LES SERVICES POLICIERS, LOI SUR LA SECURITE COMMUNAUTAIRE ET LES SERVICES POLICIERS ET LOI SUR L'UNITE DES ENQUETES SPECIALES: PREMIER TRIMESTRE 2026

REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Ottawa Police Service Board receive this report for information.

RECOMMANDATIONS DU RAPPORT

Que la Commission de service de police d'Ottawa prenne connaissance du présent rapport à titre d'information.

BACKGROUND

On April 1, 2024, the Community Safety and Policing Act (CSPA), 2019 came into force in the Province of Ontario and replaced the previous Police Services Act (PSA), 1990. This new legislative framework was established to enhance community safety, improve policing practices and foster collaboration between police services and the communities they serve.

As part of the CSPA, a new Code of Conduct for police officers has been introduced under O. Reg. 407/23. The new Code of Conduct includes modernized language, additional

categories of offences, including, both new offences and defences. In addition, a Code of Conduct has now been established for all Special Constables under O. Reg. 410/23.

Complaints Procedures

Under the CSPA, the Office of the Independent Police Review Director (OIPRD), who previously oversaw and processed all public complaints about a police service's policies, services, or the conduct of its members, has been renamed the Law Enforcement Complaints Agency (LECA) and is now led by the Complaints Director. As part of their new mandate, the LECA will only deal with conduct complaints against police officers. In addition, the LECA has the authority to investigate complaints about Chiefs and Deputy Chiefs and public interest complaints, including initiating an investigation into a police conduct, even if there is no public complaint.

All conduct complaints made by members of the public against police officers continue to be made to the LECA; however, allegations of misconduct occurring after April 1, 2024, will be assessed against the new police officer Code of Conduct under CSPA O. Reg. 407/23. The LECA may direct the officer's Chief of Police or the Chief of Police of an unrelated police service to investigate the complaint or, alternatively, retain the complaint and cause it to be investigated by a LECA investigator. Investigative results are reported to the LECA, who may overturn the findings, following a request for a review made to the Complaints Director by the complainant.

Under the CSPA, the LECA may refuse to investigate complaints if:

- The incident occurred more than six months before the complaint,
- The complainant was not directly affected by the incident,
- The conduct does not constitute misconduct, or
- The complaint is frivolous, vexatious, or not in the public interest.

Complaints where allegations occurred before April 1, 2024, will continue to be processed under the PSA.

Chiefs of Police are also now required to provide notice of misconduct to the LECA when they become aware that a member of their police service, who is a police officer, other than a Deputy Chief, may have engaged in conduct that constitutes misconduct.

Inspector General's Role

Part VII of the CSPA establishes the position of the Inspector General (IG), supported by the Inspectorate of Policing (IoP), whose mandate is to provide CSPA compliance oversight and enforcement of legal obligations for municipal police services, Chiefs of Police and boards. Such duties and authorities possessed by the IG and executed by the IoP include, advising, monitoring, issuing directions, imposing measures, conducting inspections of police services, investigating and overseeing certain types of complaints

from the public. Service complaints that occurred after April 1, 2024, will now be dealt with by the IoP and classified, as follows:

- Adequacy and effectiveness of policing (formerly a service complaint); and
- Failure of a police service board, Chief of Police, or prescribed policing provider to comply with the CSPA and its regulations, including systemic failure.

Complaints related to the policy and procedures established by the Chief of Police (formerly a policy complaint), shall be forwarded to the police service board that maintains the police service by the IG and review and the complaint as it relates to the policies and report back to the IG about steps taken in response to the complaint.

Internal Complaints

Internal Complaints (or Chief's Complaints) are initiated at the discretion of the Chief of Police for allegations of officer misconduct or non-compliance with OPS policies and may also include matters that began as a public complaint. Internal Complaints also include driving related conduct matters. Motor Vehicle Collisions (MVC), Red Light Cameras (RLC) and Automated Speed Enforcement Cameras (ASE), which make up most Internal Complaint investigations.

The PSA allows for Public and Internal conduct complaints to be finalized as substantiated or unsubstantiated. Once substantiated, they are resolved by Informal Resolution, Informal Discipline, or Formal Discipline according to the circumstances and seriousness of the misconduct.

Complaints Outcome under the CSPA

Under the CSPA, there is no distinction between misconduct of a less serious or serious nature. Once a determination of misconduct has been made, under section 200 of the CSPA, Chiefs can impose discipline, other than a demotion or dismissal, without a hearing, unless an officer requests one.

Matters requiring a hearing, will now be conducted by an independent adjudicator appointed by the Ontario Police Arbitration and Adjudication Commission (OPAAC), rather than a hearing officer appointed by the Chief.

Impact of Changes in Complaint Classification

The introduction of O. Reg. 407/23 under the CSPA has changed how the officer conduct complaints are categorized and counted. While there are now only five prescribed misconduct categories - *Compliance with Laws, Human Rights and Charter, Interactions with the Public, Integrity and Performance of Duties* – these are broader in scope than the former categories under the PSA. As a result, a wider range of behaviors may be captured within each category, even though the number of categories is fewer.

Due to these broader definitions, complaint totals under the CSPA cannot be directly compared to those recorded under the PSA, as similar incidents may now fall within a single, more inclusive category.

This report aims to provide transparency around the new complaint classifications and highlights the importance of interpreting comparisons between CSPA and PSA frameworks cautiously. The report also compares current complaint data with the same quarter from the previous year and five-year averages.

DISCUSSION

Complaints Statistics for Q1 2026

A total of 142 Public and Internal complaints were received in Q1 2026. Of these complaints, 7 (5 %) were classified under the PSA for incidents before April 1, 2024, while 135 (95%) were classified under the CSPA.

Key Statistics:

- Public Complaints (Conduct): 83 in Q1 2026, a 7% decrease from 89 in Q1 2025.
- Internal Complaints: 58 in Q1 2026, a 54% decrease from 125 in Q1 2025.

Table 1A (below) compares complaints in Q1 2026 to Q1 2025 and the five-year average, where applicable.

Table 1 - New Public and Internal Complaints Received in Q1

	Q1 2026	Q1 2025	5 YR AVG Q1	2025 Total
Public Complaint (Conduct)	83	87	123	345
Public Complaint (Policy or Service - LECA)	0	1	n/a	1
Public Complaint (Adequacy/ Effectiveness and Policy/Procedures - loP)	1	1	n/a	26
Internal Complaints (Other)	6	4	7	21
Internal Complaints (Firearm Discharge)	2	0	0	3
Internal Complaints (Red Light Camera Infractions)	18	23	18	116
Internal Complaints (MVCs)	32	29	27	98
Internal Complaints (ASEs)	0	69	n/a	377
TOTAL	142	214	n/a	987

Public Complaint Investigations

Of the 84 public complaints received by LECA and the loP in Q1 2026:

- 24 were referred to OPS Professional Standards Unit for investigation.
- 59 were screened out by the LECA.
- 1 adequacy and effectiveness of policing complaints were retained by the loP for investigation.

The LECA did not retain any complaints for their own investigation in Q1 2026.

Table 2 provides further details on public complaint investigations for Q1 2026.

Table 2 – Public Complaint Investigations in Q1 after Screening by the LECA and the IoP

	Q1 2026	Q1 2025	5 YR AVG Q1	2025 Total
Public Complaint (Conduct)	24	32	29	116
Public Complaint (Policy or Service - LECA)	0	1	n/a	1
Public Complaint (Adequacy/ Effectiveness and Policy/Procedures - IoP)	1	1	n/a	26
TOTAL	25	34	n/a	143

Classification of Officer Conduct Complaints

Officer conduct complaints are classified based on the date the incident occurred, following distinct frameworks for pre- and post-April 1, 2024, incidents.

Pre-April 1, 2024 Complaints: Complaints related to officer conduct occurring before April 1, 2024, are classified under the PSA. In Q1 2026, a total of 7 complaints (5% of all conduct complaints) were classified under the PSA, categorized as follows:

1. Improper Conduct: 6 complaints
2. Neglect of Duty: 1 complaint

These numbers reflect complaints related to incidents that occurred before the CSPA came into force.

Post-April 1, 2024 Complaints: Complaints regarding conduct occurring on or after April 1, 2024, are classified under the CSPA. A total of 134 complaints (95% of all conduct complaints) were classified under the CSPA in Q1 2026, distributed across the following categories:

1. Human Rights and Charter Rights: 2 complaints
2. Interaction with the Public: 48 complaints
3. Integrity: 1 complaint
4. Performance of Duties (including Driving-Related Conduct): 83 complaints, with 50 of these being related to driving.

Table 3A below illustrates, the total number of Public and Internal complaints dealing with officer conduct in Q1 2026 under the PSA.

Table 3A – PSA Conduct Related Complaints by Category in Q1 before screening of Public Complaints by the LECA

	Q1 2026	Q1 2025	2026 Total
Improper Conduct	6	10	25
Improper Conduct – Driving Related	0	0	1
Excessive Force	0	4	6
Neglect of Duty	1	8	27
Firearm Discharge	0	0	3
TOTAL	7	22	62

Table 3B below illustrates, the total number of Public and Internal complaints dealing with officer conduct in Q1 2026 under the CSPA.

Table 3B – CSPA Conduct Related Complaints by Category in Q1 before Screening of Public Complaints by the LECA

	Q1 2026	Q1 2025	2 YR AVG Q1	2026 Total
Performance of Duties	33	17	25	90
Performance of Duties – Driving Related	50	121	86	590
Compliance with Laws	0	2	1	2
Human Rights and Charter Rights	2	2	2	8
Interaction with Public	48	48	48	201
Integrity	1	0	1	10
TOTAL	134	190	162	901

In Q1 2026, a total of 7 conduct related complaints were received under the PSA framework. All seven complaints were screened out by the LECA and did not proceed to investigation.

No internal complaints were received during Q1 2026 that would fall under the PSA. As a result, there are no PSA conduct investigations to report for Q1 2026.

With the continued transition to the CSPA framework, PSA- related reporting is expected to diminish over time.

Table 4 (below) outlines the total number of Conduct related Public and Internal complaints that were investigated in Q1 2026 under the CSPA, after Public complaint screen-outs by the LECA. The Q1 2026 total for complaints investigated is 82.

Table 4 – CSPA Conduct Related Complaint Investigations in Q1 after Screening by the LECA

	Q1 2026	Q1 2025	2 YR AVG Q1	2026 Total
Performance of Duties	19	11	15	43
Performance of Duties – Driving Related	50	121	86	590
Compliance with Laws	0	0	0	1
Human Rights and Charter Rights	0	1	1	3
Interaction with Public	12	18	15	75
Integrity	1	0	1	5
TOTAL	82	151	118	717

Key Driver of Increased Internal Complaints

The previous increase in driving-related internal complaints was largely attributed to the Automated Speed Enforcement. With the removal of this program by the Ontario government in October 2025, these complaint volumes are expected to decrease. The OPS will continue to monitor and address driving-related conduct to ensure accountability and public confidence.

Adequacy/Effectiveness (Service) and Policy/Procedure (Policy) Complaints

There were no Service or Policy related public complaints received under the PSA from the LECA in Q1 2026.

There was one Adequacy and Effectiveness of Policing public complaint received under the CSPA from the IoP in Q1 2026. This investigation is being conducted by the IOP and remains ongoing. The results of the IOP's findings will be provided in future reports, within the quarter their investigation are completed.

Details of two Adequacy and Effectiveness of Policing complaints that were completed by the IoP in Q1 2026 are attached to this report (Document 1).

Table 5 (below) outlines the total number of Adequacy and Effectiveness of Policing and Policy and Procedures public complaints received in Q1 2026 as compared to Q1 2025, as well as the Q1 two-year average.

Table 5 - Adequacy/Effectiveness and Policy/Procedure Complaints

	Q1 2026	Q1 2025	2 YR AVG Q1	2026 Total
Policy (Board)	0	0	0	10
Service (IoP)	1	1	1	16
TOTAL	1	1	1	26

The LECA's Early Resolution Program (ERP)

In July 2020, the LECA advised that they would be streamlining early resolution processes in anticipation of changes under the CSPA. By the end of 2020, the LECA introduced the Early Resolution Program (ERP), which provides an opportunity for complainants and respondent officers to voluntarily resolve a complaint before it is formally screened in for investigation. To proceed by way of ERP, the complainant, the respondent officer(s), and the police service must agree to this option. If they do not agree to this option, the complaint is returned to the screening process, and it is either screened in for investigation or screened out by the LECA.

In Q1 2026, eight ERP files were received from the LECA. Four files were concluded after a resolution was reached, two did not proceed through ERP, as the criteria was not met and two were discontinued by the LECA, as it was not in the public interest to proceed.

Conduct Complaint Status

Table 6 (below) illustrates the Q1 2026 complaint status for Conduct related Public and Internal complaints, including a comparison with Q1 2025 and the five-year average for the same quarter:

Table 6 - Complaint Status - Conduct Complaints

RESOLUTION	Q1 2026	Q1 2025	5 YR AVG Q1
No Further Action	26	60	45
Unsubstantiated	1	0	0
Vexatious/Frivolous/Bad Faith	4	5	7
Informal Resolution	0	2	0
Informal Resolution - Mediation	0	0	0
Withdrawn by Complainant	5	5	5
Withdrawn by Complainant through Mediation	0	2	4
Withdrawn Prior to Screening of Complaint	0	1	0
Discontinued by the LECA after being referred for investigation	1	4	1
Over Six Months	1	0	1
Not in the Public Interest	51	39	80
Third Party - Not Directly Affected	1	8	4
Better Dealt with Under another Act or Law	0	0	1
No Jurisdiction – LECA	2	2	1
Conduct Does No Constitute Misconduct	0	0	0
Complaints Not Resulting in Discipline Total	92	128	149
Discipline (Section 200) – No Hearing (CSPA)	9	11	n/a
Demotion and Termination Hearing (CSPA)	0	0	n/a
Complaints Resulting in Discipline total	9	11	9
Complaints Outstanding total	40	73	58
TOTAL	141	212	216

Disciplinary Measures under the CSPA

In Q1 2026, disciplinary measures were imposed 9 times. These disciplinary measures can be broken down as follows:

1. Legislative authority for disciplinary measures:
 - Section 200 of the Act (without a hearing): 9 cases
 - Section 200 of the Act (with a hearing under section 201): 0 cases
 - Section 202 of the Act (following a hearing): 0 cases
2. Nature of Misconduct:
 - 9 cases involved performance of duties (8 were driving related)
3. Types of Disciplinary Measures Imposed:
 - A reprimand was imposed in 5 cases
 - A forfeiture and reprimand were imposed in 3 cases
 - A forfeiture, training and a reprimand were imposed in 1 case
4. Forfeiture of time:
 - The average time forfeited was 9 hours
 - The total time forfeited was 36 hours.

Member Suspensions

Both the PSA and CSPA provide that a Chief of Police, in the most serious of matters, can suspend a police officer. Suspensions are treated very seriously and only occur after a careful assessment of the case and any risk factors that may be present.

The CSPA now enables a Chief of Police to suspend an officer without pay when they are convicted and sentenced to jail, in custody or subject to bail that substantially interferes with their policing duties and/or charged with an off duty indictable offence under the Criminal Code, the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act or the Cannabis Act.

There were two officers suspended in Q1 2026, compared to none in Q1 2025, and above the five-year Q1 average of one. At the start of Q1 2026, there were five officers on suspension, which increased to six by the end of Q1 2026.

Special Investigations Unit (SIU) Investigations

The Special Investigations Unit Act, 2019, authorizes the SIU to conduct criminal investigations into circumstances involving police where serious injury or death has occurred, a firearm discharge at a person or where there are allegations of sexual assault.

The Board receives a separate report on each SIU case in every instance where the investigation is concluded by a report from the SIU Director. The SIU invoked its mandate nine times in Q1 2026. Both investigations remain ongoing.

Table 10 (below) provides a comparator of SIU investigations between Q1 2026 and Q1 2025, as well as the five-year average for the same quarter.

Table 7 - Special Investigations Unit Investigations

TYPES OF INVESTIGATIONS	Q1 2026	Q1 2025	5 YR AVG Q1
Death	1	1	0
Serious Injury	7	2	3
Sexual Assault	1	0	1
Discharge of Firearm at Person	0	0	0
TOTAL	9	3	4

Complaint Reviews

The PSA and CSPA provides that public complainants may seek a review of the Chief's decision on a conduct complaint received from the LECA. In Q1 2026, there was one request for review, which is a decrease from the three requests for reviews received in Q1 2025.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

APPENDIX 1 - Summary of Adequacy/Effectiveness of Policing public complaint investigations that were completed by the IoP in Q1 2026.

CONCLUSION

The OPS Professional Standards Unit strives to uphold the highest standards of conduct and accountability for its members. With the transition to the CSPA, the Unit continues to handle complaints under the updated framework while addressing conduct issues fairly and efficiently. This commitment reinforces public trust and ensures that integrity remains at the core of policing.

APPENDIX 1 – Summary of Adequacy/Effectiveness of Policing public complaint investigations that were completed by the IoP in Q1 2026.

OPS Complaint #:	24-0944
IoP Investigation #:	24-10
Date of Incident:	06 May 2024
Date Complaint Received:	16 October 2024
Date Completed:	30 December 2025

Summary of Complaint:

The complainant alleged that the OPS failed to respond to a 911 call from a daycare related to an aggressive person within a reasonable time.

Summary of Findings and Actions Taken:

The IoP found that the OPS provided “adequate and effective” policing in the circumstances by complying with the standards related to dispatch in the Adequate and Effective Policing Regulation.

Complaint #: 24-0683
loP Investigation #: 24-7
Date of Incident: 2021 to April 2024
Date Complaint Received: 29 July 2024
Date Completed: 12 March 2026

Summary of Complaint:

The complainant alleged that bicycle thefts are increasing in downtown Ottawa and claims the Ottawa Police Service is not doing enough to address the issue. The complainant attributed the thefts to individuals from encampments and local shelters and expressed frustration that this behaviour appeared to be tolerated by city councillors, police, and shelter organizations. The complainant further believes that taxpayers are not being adequately protected and she proposed targeted measures against homeless encampments and missions to address the problem of bicycle thefts.

Summary of Findings and Actions Taken:

The loP found there was no evidence that the OPS or OPSB failed to provide adequate and effective policing in their response to bicycle thefts. On the contrary, the loP found the OPS and OPSB met the applicable standards contained in the Act's regulations concerning the two applicable policing functions: crime prevention and law enforcement.