



## Kingston Police

### Public Agenda Information Report

To: Kingston Police Service Board

From: Scott Gee, Deputy Chief of Police

Subject: Aggregate Discipline & Public Complaints

Date: January 22, 2026

---

#### **Strategic Priority Alignment:**

#### **Administrative/Procedural**

#### **Recommendation:**

That the Aggregate Discipline & Public Complaints Report, Report Number 26-02, is for information only.

#### **Background/Analysis:**

In accordance with section 215 of the *Community Safety and Policing Act*, and O.Reg. 90/24, the Chief of Police must report the following information, regarding disciplinary measures and hearings, to the Police Service Board:

1. Each Provision of Ontario Regulation 407/23 (Code of Conduct for Police Officers) made under the Act under which a disciplinary measure was imposed, which type of measure was imposed, and the number of times each type of measure was imposed in relation to the provision:

Result: Two disciplinary measures (Informal Resolution regarding Performance of Duties).

2. The number of times a disciplinary measure was imposed:
  - i. Under section 200 of the Act (suspension, forfeit of pay, reprimands), without a hearing under section 201 of the Act,

- ii. Under section 200 of the Act, following a hearing under section 201 of the Act, or
- iii. Following a hearing under section 202 of the Act (termination or demotion).

Result: One disciplinary measure imposed under subsection i.

Note: Section 200 allows a chief of police to impose a disciplinary measure, if an investigation under section 198 (Chief's Complaint) or under part X (Public Complaints) gives the Chief reasonable grounds that the officer engaged in conduct that constitutes misconduct or unsatisfactory work performance.

3. If a disciplinary measure referred to in paragraph 1, 2 or 3 of subsection 200(1) of the Act was imposed, for each paragraph:

- i. The average number of days or hours, and
- ii. The total number of days or hours.

Result: Forfeiture of 5 days pay (40 hours).

4. Any imposition of a disciplinary measure under section 200 of the Act without a hearing under section 201 of the Act in a previous period that was upheld, varied or overturned following a hearing during the period covered by the report, and information respecting any consequent effect on information included in a previous report:

Result: Not Applicable.

In addition, we have provided an annual report on public complaints under Part X of the *Community Safety and Policing Act*.

During the period January 1 to December 31, 2025, there were 57 public complaints received by Professional Standards.

[THIS SPACE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

## 1. Status of Investigations

The status of the complaints are as follows:

<b>Resolved</b>	Unsubstantiated	9
	Substantiated	0
	Screened out by LECA <sup>1</sup> : not in the public interest / frivolous / over 6 months	38
	Informal Resolution (IR)	3
	Early Resolution (ER)	1
	Withdrawn/Terminated by LECA	2
<b>Unresolved</b>	Under investigation or not yet concluded	4
	<b>Total</b>	57

## 2. Classification of Allegations

The classification<sup>2</sup> of the 17 screened in public complaints received between January 1 and June 30, 2025, are detailed below:

Interactions with the Public (CSPA)	9
Unnecessary Exercise of Authority / Use of Force	2
Neglect of Duty	5
Use of Insulting Language	1

## 3. Status of Investigations from 2025

There are 4 complaints from 2025 still under investigation.

## 4. Local Response Summary Reports

Pursuant to section 197 of the CSPA local complaints must be reported to LECA.

A Local Response Summary report is filed when a complainant requests a local resolution, outside of the formal complaint process.

There were 9 Local Response Summary reports filed during the period January 1 to December 31, 2025.

---

1 It should be noted that if a complaint is screened out by LECA, the complaint will still be reviewed and may be investigated by the Kingston Police if deemed necessary. Please see Appendix A for the LECA screening criteria, as available at [www.leca.ca](http://www.leca.ca).

2 The primary substantive issue alleged in the complaint.

**Financial Considerations:**

N/A

**Contacts:**

Scott Gee, Deputy Chief of Police

Kevin Closs, Acting Staff Sergeant, Professional Standards Unit

**Exhibits Attached:**

Appendix A – LECA Screening

## **Appendix A**

### **LECA Screening**

When LECA receives a complaint, our staff ensures the complaint form is complete and signed. If additional information is required before the complaint can be screened, a case coordinator will contact the complainant by phone or email before the complaint can proceed.

Our case coordinators examine each complaint to determine its type – conduct complaint.

All complaints are presumed to be screened in, unless there is a reason to screen out the complaint under s. 158 of the Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019.

### **Complaints Screened Out**

A complaint may be screened out for one of these reasons:

**Bad faith:** Complaints where there is clear evidence that it was made for an improper purpose or motive. For example, a complaint made with the intention of deceiving LECA or police services.

**Better dealt with under another act/law:** Complaints that are better dealt with by another in another forum or venue. For example, a complaint that takes issue with the speed a person was travelling when they received a traffic ticket is better dealt with in court.

**Frivolous:** A complaint is frivolous when it does not reveal any allegation of misconduct or breach of the Code of Conduct, or is trivial, lacks substance or an air of reality.

**No jurisdiction:** The complaint is not about police conduct; the police officer the complaint is about does not fall under the jurisdiction of LECA; or the complainant is excluded from filing a complaint.

**Not in the public interest:** Under section 158 of the CSPA, the Complaints Director can screen out a complaint if “having regard to all the circumstances, dealing with the complaint is not in the public interest.”

**Over six months:** Under s. 158(1) of the CSPA, the Director may decide not to deal with a complaint if it is made more than six months from the date of the incident cited in the complaint or when the incident was discovered by the complainant. The “six months” is not a statutory deadline. In determining whether to deal with a complaint

older than six months, the Director may exercise his discretion and must consider the following criteria outlined in the act:

Whether the complainant is a minor or has a disability within the meaning of the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005.

Whether the complainant is or was subject to criminal proceedings related to the events underlying the complaint.

Whether, having regard to all the circumstances, it is in the public interest for the complaint to be dealt with.

If a complaint is received after six months, LECA may ask the complainant to provide reasons for the delay in filing. The Director will also consider when the complainant first learned of the alleged misconduct. All circumstances, including the reason for delay and the severity of the complaint, are considered.

**Not Affected by Conduct:** The complainant was not affected by the conduct of the person who is the subject of the complaint. For the purpose of this part, only the following people are considered affected:

A person at whom the conduct was directed.

A person who saw or heard the conduct or its effects as a result of being physically present at the time and place that the conduct or its effects occurred.

A person who,

- i) was in a personal relationship with a person described in paragraph 1 at the time that the conduct occurred, and
- ii) suffered loss, damage, distress, danger or inconvenience as a result of the conduct.

**Vexatious:** A vexatious complaint may be one that was made out of anger or the desire to seek retribution. Vexatious complaints may lack a reasonable purpose or be made with the intention to harass or annoy and are often repetitive (filing the same complaint numerous times after the previous complaint was screened out or filing repeated complaints about the same officer).