



LONDON POLICE SERVICE BOARD

OPEN MEETING AGENDA

Thursday, January 15, 2026, 10:00 am and 1:00 pm

Police HQ Executive Boardroom 601 Dundas Street

[Link to Livestreams 10:00 AM](#) and [1:00PM](#)

	ITEM	LEAD	DETAILS
OPEN MEETING PART One: 10:00 am			
1	Call Open Meeting to Order	Chair	
2	Swearing in of New Board Member Mr. Jeffrey Lang	Chair	Information
3	Motion to move to a Closed meeting pursuant to Section 44(1)(b) and 44(2) of the <i>Community Safety and Policing Act</i> to discuss confidential matters related to labour relations, Finance, and Legal.	Chair	Decision
CLOSED MEETING AND BREAK UNTIL 1:00 pm			
OPEN MEETING PART Two: 1:00 pm			
	Procedural Matters		
1	Opening Remarks	Chair	Information
	Disclosures of Interest		
	Introduction of New Business		
	Approval of Minutes: December 17, 2025 , LPSB Open Meeting		Decision
2	Chair and Vice-Chair Annual Elections (2026)	CGO	Decision
3	Special Guest: K9 Swearing In	Chief	Information
	London Police Service Board		
4	4.1 Sponsorships and Awards for 2026 Report #2601PB01	Chair	Decision
	4.2 Board Member Travel and Training Summary Report #2601PB02	Chair	Information
	Executive Administration: Professional Standards Branch		
5	5.1 Sec 81 CSPA RE SIU 24-OCI-551 Report #2601EA01	DC Bastien	Information
	5.2 Sec 81 CSPA RE SIU 25-OCI-004 Report #2601EA02		
	5.3 Sec 81 CSPA RE SIU 25-OCI-293 Report #2601EA03		
	5.4 Sec 81 CSPA RE SIU 25-OCI-313 Report #2601EA04		

Next Scheduled LPSB Open Meeting Date: February 19, 2025

6	Verbal Updates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair Gauss • Chief Governance Officer Johanssen • Chief Truong 	Chair CGO Chief	Information
7	New Business	Chair	Information
8	ADJOURNMENT	Chair	



LONDON POLICE SERVICE BOARD

MINUTES FROM THE OPEN MEETING

Wednesday, December 17, 2025

HYBRID: Police Headquarters-Executive Boardroom / Teams

ATTENDANCE	
LONDON POLICE SERVICE BOARD	LONDON POLICE SERVICE
Ryan Gauss, Chair	Chief Thai Truong
Nancy Branscombe, Vice Chair	Deputy Chief Paul Bastien (Regrets)
Steve Lehman, Member	Deputy Chief Scott Guilford
Josh Morgan, Member (Regrets)	Deputy Chief MacSween
Susan Stevenson, Member	Legal Director Madeline McKinnon
Mike Wallace, Member (Regrets)	Sam Santos, Executive Assistant
Stephanie Johanssen, Executive Director	
Melanie Coleman, Executive Assistant	
GUESTS	
Ron LeClair, Police Service Advisor	Addison Nadrofsky, YIPI Recipient
Jody Graham, Director of Legal Services	Superintendent Blair Harvey
Jason Senese, Director, Capital Assets and Projects at City of London	Sean-Michael Stephen, Watson and Associates
Jessie Rodger, Executive Director, Anova	Jennifer Dunn, London Abused Women's Centre

1. Procedural Matters

Meeting Called to Order: 9:07 am

Moved By: S. Stevenson
Seconded By: N. Branscombe

“**THAT** The London Police Service Board moves from Open to Closed Session pursuant to Section 44(2) of the Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019.”

CARRIED

1. Procedural Matters

Return To Open Meeting: 1:00 pm

Disclosures of Interest: Chair Gauss noted that Member Wallace had declared a conflict regarding Item #3, Development Charge Study Report #2512FF03, during the closed session.

New Business: None

Moved By: N. Branscombe
Seconded By: S. Stevenson

“**THAT** The London Police Service Board accept and approves the minutes of the November 24, 2025 Board Meeting as presented.”

CARRIED

2. Ceremonial and Special Matters

YIPI Scholarship Award Presentation

The Board recognized Addison Nidrovsky as one of three recipients of the London Police Service Board scholarship associated with the Youth in Policing Initiative (YIPI). The Board highlighted that the program provides local youth with hands-on experience in policing, mentorship, leadership development, and pathways to post-secondary education and careers. The Chief spoke to the value of YIPI in building trust with marginalized communities, supporting crime prevention, and investing in youth, noting that several current officers are former program participants. The Board congratulated the recipient and reaffirmed its continued support for the program.

3. Finance

Development Charge Study Report #2512FF03

Mr. Senese, Director, Capital Assets and Projects at the City of London, and Mr. Stephen, Watson and Associates, joined the Board to answer any questions.

Moved By: S Stevenson

Seconded By: N. Branscombe

“**THAT** the London Police Service Board approve the Growth Capital Needs Assessment, which represents the gross capital costs for inclusion in the City’s 2028 Development Charge (D.C.) Background Study prior to D.C deductions

CARRIED

4. Presentation

Anova and London Abused Women’s Centre – Case Review Advisory Committee

The Board received a presentation from Jessie Rodger and Jennifer Dunn around the work, findings, and recommendations of the Sexual Assault Case Review Committee. The presenters acknowledged the leadership and advocacy of community partners in raising awareness and advancing support for survivors of sexual violence and recognized the contributions of London Police Service members to child abuse and sexual assault investigations. The discussion covered innovative approaches to victim reporting, such as virtual reporting models, and the importance of trauma- and violence-informed practices. Chief Truong outlined current and evolving officer training, including foundational trauma-informed training at the police college, specialized training for sexual assault investigators, and a new service delivery model that builds investigative expertise across all sections to improve response, capacity, and outcomes for the community.

5. LPSB: Oversight and Statutory Compliance

Community Safety and Policing Act (CSPA) Compliance: Strategic Plan Consultations and Diversity Plan Approval Report #2412PB01

Section 37(1)(e) of the *CSPA* requires the board to prepare and adopt a diversity plan to ensure that members of the Police Service reflect the diversity of the area for which the Board has policing responsibility.

Moved By: N. Branscombe

Seconded By: S. Stevenson

“THAT The London Police Service Board adopt the Board Diversity Plan as presented, designate it as a guiding document for the Service’s operational EDI Plan and related work, and direct its implementation and monitoring in accordance with the Board’s strategic priorities and oversight responsibilities; and,

THAT the London Police Service presents its plan to operationalize this guiding document at an upcoming open Board meeting to ensure alignment.”

CARRIED

6. Verbal Updates

Chair Gauss provided a verbal update on the Board’s work throughout 2025 and thanked everyone for their commitment and contributions. Highlights included introducing a new Board visual identity; increasing focus on communication, transparency, governance training, and community engagement; re-establishing advisory committees; participating in provincial conferences; and initiating an external organizational review that led to changes to the governance and leadership model. The Chair noted progress on strategic planning, diversity initiatives, policy development, fiscal accountability and advocacy, and reaffirmed the Board’s commitment to transparency and responsible stewardship of public funds.

Chief Truong provided a verbal update noting that service data, metrics, and crime trends have shown significant improvement over the past two years, driven by focused efforts and collaboration across the organization. The Chief also marked the one-year anniversary of the tragic death of a seven-year-old, acknowledging the impact on the family and community, and advised that the Service is supporting the family in their advocacy for awareness and potential legislative change to help prevent similar tragedies.

7. New Business

No New Business.

8. Adjournment

Moved By: S. Stevenson

Seconded By: S. Lehman

“THAT The London Police Service Board Adjourn the Open Session of the December 17, 2025 meeting and move back into closed session.”

CARRIED

Adjournment 1:48 pm

Ryan Gauss, Chair
London Police Service Board

Date

DRAFT



LONDON POLICE SERVICE BOARD REPORT

BOARD MEETING DATE: January 15th, 2026

BOARD REPORT #: 2601PB01

MEETING: Open

TO: Chair and Members of the London Police Service Board

FROM: Chief Governance Officer Stephanie Johanssen

SUBJECT: **2026 Sponsorships and Awards**

- Discussion
- Seeking Decision

RECOMMENDATION(S):

THAT:

1. The London Police Service Board (the Board) approve the 2026 Sponsorships and Awards Program, including both known and anticipated sponsorships and awards, with a total annual funding envelope not to exceed an amount as determined by the Board;
2. The Board review the sponsorship and awards amounts for the current standing sponsorships listed in this report, namely: *Lewis Coray Trailblazer Award*, *Youth in Policing Initiative Scholarship*, and *Fanshaw College* (the amount for the *Western Scholarship* is dependent on the amount in the Western Account and the number of applications);
3. The Board consider and approves the proposed criteria outlined in the report with respect to approving individual sponsorships and awards; and,
4. The Board delegates authority to the Chair and Chief Governance Officer (the CGO) to determine and approve anticipated and currently unconfirmed individual sponsorships and awards within this envelope, provided they align with the Board's mandate, applicable policies, and approved criteria.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The Board may wish to establish an annual funding envelope for 2026 within the current 2026 Board Governance budget, from which individual conference and event sponsorships, awards, and recognition programs can be funded.

It is recommended that this amount be \$30,000 and be absorbed into the 'Other Administrative Expenses' line item within the budget.

PURPOSE:

At its March 20th, 2025 meeting, the Board resolved to review standing sponsorships at its January 2026 Board meeting (Report #2503PB03).

The purpose of this report is to: provide an overview of standing sponsorships and awards along with conference and event sponsorships; seek the Board’s approval of a 2026 Sponsorships and Awards Program, including both known and anticipated sponsorships and awards; set criteria for approving sponsorships and awards; and, establish an annual funding envelope and delegated authority to the Chair and CGO to support effective administration throughout the year.

Sponsorships for professional police governance associations are separate from, and in addition to, the Board’s existing annual membership fees.

BACKGROUND:

Sponsorships and awards are an important tool through which the Board demonstrates leadership, supports professional development and the local community, and contributes to police governance. Sponsorships are a form of engagement with community and sector partners to support learning, innovation, and recognition aligned with the Board’s mandate. Several Board-supported sponsorships and awards are recurring and have historically been funded at set amounts. Other sponsorship opportunities arise throughout the year, particularly in connection with conferences, training sessions, events, or sector initiatives, where costs and opportunities are not confirmed during annual budgeting.

A program-level approval with clear parameters enables effective oversight while supporting operational efficiency and timely engagement.

OVERVIEW:

Standing Sponsorships

The Board has historically sponsored various awards and initiatives that align with its strategic goals and community engagement priorities. These sponsorships foster industry recognition, support community partners, and reinforce the organization’s visibility.

The amounts listed reflect historical practice and may be revisited within the approved funding envelope.

The following sponsorships are currently confirmed on a standing basis:

- **Lewis Coray Trailblazer Sponsorship Award: \$1,000**
The Lewis Coray Trailblazer Award Ceremony celebrates youth from the African, Caribbean and Black Canadian communities and honours the legacy of Lewis “Bud” Coray, London Police Service’s first Black officer.

February

Winner	\$500.00
1 Runner Up	\$250.00
2 Runner Up	\$250.00

- **YIPI Scholarship: \$4,000**

This scholarship supports graduates of the Youth in Policing Initiative (YIPI) who are pursuing post-secondary education. It helps former YIPI participants to continue their studies and build on their policing and community service experience.

September

4 Winners \$1,000.00 Each

- **Fanshawe College Police Foundations and Protection, Security and Investigations Academic Award: \$1,000**

Presented to a high-achieving student in the Police Foundations or Protection, Security & Investigations programs, this award recognizes dedication to law enforcement and public safety.

September

2 Winners \$500.00 Each

- **Western University Award**

A scholarship available to a full-time student at Western University, supporting academic success across any faculty or program.

December

The amount varies based on the Western account balance and the number of applications.

Conference and Event Sponsorships

The board regularly engages with sector associations through conference sponsorships and event participation.

Associations such as the Ontario Association of Police Service Boards (OAPSB) and the Canadian Association of Police Governance (CAPG) host conferences that serve as forums for governance learning, legislative updates, sector collaboration, and relationship-building. In addition to annual conferences, these organizations and others may host regional meetings, leadership forums, training sessions, or special events throughout the year, presenting sponsorship opportunities aligned with the Board's mandate.

Police Boards also sponsor and participate in events such as community galas and civic addresses to build relationships, promote information sharing, and strengthen collaboration with municipal partners, community stakeholders, and peers in policing and governance. Participation in events such as the Chief's Gala or the Mayor's State of the City address supports the Board's sector engagement and enhances its visibility and credibility. Sponsorships demonstrate leadership and presence in community and policing dialogue beyond meetings. These types of public-sector sponsorships are recognized practices.

Conference and event sponsorships are separate from annual membership fees, which are addressed elsewhere in the Board's governance budget and are not the subject of this report. Specific sponsorship amounts may vary by event and are often confirmed closer to the event date.

Examples of anticipated sponsorships and events include:

- Association (CAPG, OAPSB, CACP) conferences and related governance events.
- Other governance, leadership, or policing related conferences where sponsorship supports learning, collaboration, or sector advancement.
- Other community, governance, or policing related events where sponsorship supports sector collaboration (e.g. LPS Chief's Gala, the Mayor's State of the City address, awards events)

PROPOSED CRITERIA:

In administering the 2026 Sponsorships and Awards program, the Chair and CGO shall assess proposed sponsorships and awards against the criteria that guide decision-making and support principled judgment. Not all criteria will apply to every sponsorship or award; rather, they should be applied collectively, considering the nature, purpose, and context of the sponsorship or award.

- 1) *Alignment with Board mandate and strategic priorities*
 - Relevance to the Board's legislated mandate and governance role.
 - Connection to Board strategic priorities, policies, or work plans.
- 2) *Governance, Leadership, and Professional Development Value*
 - Supports governance education, leadership development, sector collaboration, or legislative awareness.
 - Contributes to professional development, knowledge sharing, or best practice
- 3) *Public Interest, Community, or Sector Benefit*
 - Demonstrates benefit to the public interest, community, or policing sector.
 - Supports recognition, education, or positive contributions through awards, scholarships, community initiatives or policing related events.
- 4) *Relationship and Engagement Value*
 - Strengthens relationships with sector partners, educational institutions, or community organizations.
 - Supports meaningful engagement through conferences, galas, or recognition events.
- 5) *Reputational and Ethical Considerations*
 - Consistent with the Board's values, policies, and public accountability obligations.
 - Avoids actual or perceived conflicts of interest.
- 6) *Financial Reasonableness and Stewardship*
 - Cost is reasonable in relation to the purpose and anticipated benefit.
 - Within the approved annual Sponsorships and Awards funding envelope.
- 7) *Equity, Fairness, and Accessibility*
 - Supports fair, inclusive and transparent participation or recognition where applicable.
 - Avoids inequitable outcomes.
- 8) *Transparency and Accountability*
 - Clear purpose and scope for the sponsorship or award.
 - Documented, tracked, and reported to the Board and listed on the Board's website.

Sponsorships and awards that fall outside of these guiding principles and considerations, exceed delegated authority, or raise reputational considerations will be referred to the Board for specific approval.



LONDON POLICE SERVICE BOARD REPORT

BOARD MEETING DATE: January 15th, 2026

BOARD REPORT #: 2601PB02

MEETING: Open

TO: Chair and Members of the London Police Service Board

FROM: Stephanie Johanssen, Chief Governance Officer

SUBJECT: **Board Member Travel and Training Summary Update**

- Discussion
- Seeking Decision

RECOMMENDATION(S):

For Information and Discussion.

PURPOSE:

This report provides the Board with an overview of 2026 conferences and events requiring travel and a summary of board members' travel expenses in 2025. The Travel and Convention Expense Policy is currently under review as part of an overall overhaul of organizational policies.

In the interim, the Board will continue to uphold transparency and accountability by reporting member travel expenses quarterly.

SUMMARY:

2026 Conferences:

Board members are encouraged to attend police governance and policing conferences to build governance and strategic skills and stay informed about emerging trends, industry best practices, and legislative changes. Conference attendance supports advocacy, visibility, connection building, and future planning.

Key conferences for Board members to attend are summarized below. This list is not exhaustive, and some dates are still to be determined. Participation is subject to budget availability and the Chair's approval if multiple members wish to attend.

Canadian Association of Police Governance

CAPG Annual Conference	TBD	Edmonton, Ontario
------------------------	-----	-------------------

Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police

Leadership Conference	January 18-20	Vancouver, B.C
Annual Conference	May 31 – June 3	Niagara Falls, Ontario

Ontario Association of Police Boards (OAPSB)

Joint Labour Conference with PAO and OACP	February 24-25	Toronto
Spring Conference and A.G.M.	June 1 – 3	Niagara Falls Ontario

International Association of Chiefs of Police

Annual Conference	October 24 – 27	Orlando, Florida
-------------------	-----------------	------------------

Other:

- Canadian Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement Annual Conference TBD
- Canadian Institute Law of Policing Conference, May 13-14
- Building Bridges Evidence-Based Policing Conference TBD

The current 2026 Budget allotment for Travel and Training is \$48,000.

2025 Board Member Travel/Training and Conference Expenditure:

Ryan Gauss, Chair

<u>Purpose</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Dates</u>	<u>Total Expense*</u>
Police Memorial	Toronto	May 4	\$ 269.75
2025 Spring Conferenece and AGMOAPSB	London	Jun3-5	\$ 775.00
Suicide Memorial	Toronto	June 21-22	\$ 713.42
CAPG Conference	Victoria	AUG14-17	\$ 5,092.37
Beyond to the Blue Gala	Toronto	Sep 14	\$ 216.72
Police Memorial	Ottawa	Sep 27-28	\$ 775.39
IACP 2025 Conference	Denver, USA	OCT17-21	\$ 5,596.53

Nancy Branscombe, Vice-Chair

<u>Purpose</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Dates</u>	<u>Total Expense*</u>
OAPSB Conference	London, ON	Jun3-5	\$ 775.00
IACP 2025 Conference	Denver, USA	OCT17-20	\$ 4,082.65

Susan Stevenson, Member

<u>Purpose</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Dates</u>	<u>Total Expense*</u>
2025 CAPG Conference	Victoria, BC	AUG 14-19	\$ 4,908.92

*Amounts reported are net of any applicable tax credits

Total: 23,025.75

CONCLUSION:

This report is for information.



LONDON POLICE SERVICE

REPORT TO THE LONDON POLICE SERVICE BOARD

BOARD MEETING DATE: January 15, 2026
BOARD REPORT #: 2601EA01
MEETING: Open
CSPA SECTION: N/A

TO: Chair and Members of the London Police Service Board
FROM: Paul Bastien, Deputy Chief
SUBJECT: **Report on Investigation Pursuant to s. 81(1) CSPA
SIU Case 24-OCI-551 (Custody Injury)**
PURPOSE: Update / Information Purposes Only

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the London Police Service Board receive this report for the stated purpose.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

N/A

SUMMARY:

On October 2, 2025, the Special Investigations Unit closed an investigation into the actions of a sworn member of the London Police Service after an individual in the officer's custody sustained an injury presumed to be a "serious injury" as set out in the *Special Investigations Unit Act, 2019*. The Director concluded that there was no basis upon which to believe that the officer committed a criminal offence and the matter was investigated by the LPS Professional Standards Branch as required by s. 81 of the *Community Safety and Policing Act, 2023*. The PSB investigation found that the officer involved¹ complied with standards of conduct and that relevant LPS procedures and policing provided by the LPS were adequate.

DISCUSSION:

Background

The CSPA requires that the Chief investigate officer conduct and the adequacy of relevant procedures and policing provided as they pertain to the incidents investigated under s. 15 of the SIU Act.² Pursuant to s. 81(4) of the Act, this is the Chief's report to the Board in respect of the investigation into the above-referenced incident, submitted in accordance with s. 8 of O. Reg. 90/24, CSPA and Board policy LPS-2-IAS-001.

¹ An involved officer may be a "Subject Official" (if their conduct appears, in the opinion of the SIU Director, to have been the cause of the incident under investigation) or a "Witness Official" (if, in the opinion of the Director, the officer was involved in the incident but is not a Subject Official).

² SIU Director may cause an investigation to be conducted into any incident in which any of the following occurs, if the incident may have resulted from criminal conduct by an official: the death or serious injury of a person, the discharge of a firearm at a person, or the sexual assault of a person, as reported by the person.

Incident Summary

On December 22, 2024, a police sergeant observed an individual smoking what appeared to be illicit drugs in London, Ontario. After confirming the person had outstanding warrants with the Ontario Provincial Police (OPP), the sergeant arrested the individual and transported them to the London Police Service Headquarters Detention Unit (HDU). During intake, suspected crystal methamphetamine was found among the individual's belongings, though no charges were laid for possession. Shortly after, OPP officers assumed custody and transferred the individual to their Tillsonburg detachment.

The following day, the individual ingested fentanyl that had been concealed in their body, resulting in a severe overdose requiring hospitalization at Tillsonburg General Hospital. The OPP notified the Special Investigations Unit (SIU), which launched an inquiry. One officer was designated as a Subject Official, and another as a Witness Official. On October 2, 2025, the SIU concluded its investigation, finding no grounds for criminal charges and formally closed the case.

Summary of Findings: Special Investigations Unit

The review concluded that the care provided to the Complainant while in police custody met the requirements of criminal law. The central issue was how the Complainant managed to ingest fentanyl while detained. Four pat-down searches were conducted, including one at the arrest scene and another before placement in a cell at the OPP Detachment. The Director was satisfied with the adequacy of the searches performed.

The fentanyl consumed had been hidden in an area of the body that rendered detection during pat-downs unlikely. While a strip search might have uncovered the drugs, by law, such searches are only permissible on reasonable grounds. Given the circumstances—including prior searches and the Complainant's coherent condition—the decision not to conduct a strip search was found to be reasonable. Similarly, continuous monitoring in the cell was not deemed necessary, as the Complainant appeared stable and had already been searched multiple times.

Ultimately, the Director concluded that there was no basis for criminal charges.

Summary of Findings: LPS Professional Standards Branch

The procedures most relevant to this review were AD-002.01 (SIU Incidents), LE-004.01 (Search and Seizure), and LE-010.02 (Searches of Persons in Custody).

The review found that members were not aware the incident would fall under the SIU mandate at the time of custody. This lack of awareness was not attributable to bad faith, willful blindness, or ignorance. The individual was in LPS custody for approximately one and a half hours before being transferred to the OPP and the overdose occurred approximately twenty-four hours after leaving LPS custody. Once notified that the SIU had invoked its mandate, the involved officers complied fully with the applicable procedure.

The procedures governing search and seizure, as well as searches of persons in custody, were followed by all involved members. There is no evidence of misconduct or procedural breach, and actions taken were consistent with LPS procedure and legislative requirements.

Corrective Action

Considering the findings, there is no corrective action warranted. However, the PSB investigation recommended that procedures relating to persons in custody be reviewed with a view to standardizing the documentation of hand-off of persons in custody from the LPS to another agency. The recommendation has been referred to the Support Services Division for appropriate follow-up.

CONCLUSION:

The Professional Standards Branch investigation determined that London Police Service procedures related to the incident were in keeping with legislation and otherwise provide adequate and appropriate guidance to members.

With respect to the conduct of the designated officials, the investigation determined it to have complied with standards set out in the Community Safety and Policing Act and with London Police Service procedure.

PREPARED BY: Charlene Humble, Inspector – Professional Standards Branch



LONDON POLICE SERVICE

REPORT TO THE LONDON POLICE SERVICE BOARD

BOARD MEETING DATE: January 15, 2026
BOARD REPORT #: 2601EA02
MEETING: Open
CSPA SECTION: N/A

TO: Chair and Members of the London Police Service Board
FROM: Paul Bastien, Deputy Chief
SUBJECT: Report on Investigation Pursuant to s. 81(1) CSPA
SIU Case 25-OCI-004 (Custody Injury)
PURPOSE: Update / Information Purposes Only

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the London Police Service Board receive this report for the stated purpose.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS: (if applicable)

N/A

SUMMARY:

On September 18, 2025, the Special Investigations Unit closed an investigation into the actions of a sworn member of the London Police Service after an individual in the officer's custody sustained an injury presumed to be a "serious injury" as set out in the *Special Investigations Unit Act, 2019*. The Director concluded that there was no basis upon which to believe that the officer committed a criminal offence and the matter was investigated by the LPS Professional Standards Branch as required by s. 81 of the *Community Safety and Policing Act, 2023*. The PSB investigation found that the officers involved¹ complied with standards of conduct and that relevant LPS procedures and policing provided by the LPS were adequate.

DISCUSSION:

Background

The CSPA requires that the Chief investigate officer conduct and the adequacy of relevant procedures and policing provided as they pertain to the incidents investigated under s. 15 of the SIU Act.² Pursuant to s. 81(4) of the Act, this is the Chief's report to the Board in respect of the investigation into the above-referenced incident, submitted in accordance with s. 8 of O. Reg. 90/24, CSPA and Board policy LPS-2-IAS-001.

¹ An involved officer may be a "Subject Official" (if their conduct appears, in the opinion of the SIU Director, to have been the cause of the incident under investigation) or a "Witness Official" (if, in the opinion of the Director, the officer was involved in the incident but is not a Subject Official).

² SIU Director may cause an investigation to be conducted into any incident in which any of the following occurs, if the incident may have resulted from criminal conduct by an official: the death or serious injury of a person, the discharge of a firearm at a person, or the sexual assault of a person, as reported by the person.

Incident Summary

On January 3, 2025, emergency services were contacted regarding an individual experiencing a severe dissociative episode. After taking newly prescribed medication capable of causing hallucination and mood swings, the individual left their residence in a confused state and could not recognize people and surroundings familiar to them.

Police officers attended the scene and attempted to facilitate voluntary transport to a hospital, but the individual, who was armed with a pair of scissors, refused. When informed of apprehension under the Mental Health Act, the individual raised the scissors in a threatening manner toward an officer and in response, an officer deployed a conducted energy weapon (CEW), striking the individual.

Following CEW deployment, the individual became temporarily unresponsive. Emergency medical services transported the individual to hospital. The individual was admitted to critical care and intubated. The Special Investigations Unit was notified and invoked its mandate.

Summary of Findings: Special Investigations Unit

The Special Investigations Unit investigation was significantly delayed due to complexities surrounding medical issues. The Director's Report noted that, unbeknownst to police at the time, the complainant had a vagus nerve stimulation (VNS) device intended to manage a seizure condition. Whether the officers' actions (such as the use of a CEW) may have contributed to the complainant's medical event could not be determined despite consultation with the manufacturer and medical professionals.

In the final report to the Attorney General, the SIU Director concluded there were no reasonable grounds to believe the Subject Official committed a criminal offence. The analysis emphasized that officers acted within their legal authority under the Mental Health Act and were protected by the Criminal Code in using force deemed reasonably necessary. The Director further noted that the officer could not have anticipated the presence of the VNS device, and that its potential interaction with the CEW remained uncertain.

Summary of Findings: LPS Professional Standards Branch

The PSB investigation determined that on the day of the incident, the individual exhibited erratic behavior, refused to surrender scissors concealed in a sleeve, and failed to recognize familiar surroundings. Based on the information provided and observed behavior, officers acted within their authority under the Mental Health Act to apprehend the individual.

During the encounter, the individual produced scissors and raised them in a threatening manner, creating an imminent risk of serious bodily harm or death. Officers responded by using soft physical control and deploying a Conducted Energy Weapon (CEW). There was no evidence of blunt-force injuries, indicating that the physical control did not cause harm. The deployment of the CEW was found to have been reasonable and necessary given the imminent threat. Although greater force could have been legally justified in the circumstances, it was not used.

The officers' actions were consistent with the lawful execution of their duties and aligned with training guidelines. The use of force applied was proportionate to the threat level and demonstrated appropriate judgment under the circumstances.

CONCLUSION:

The Professional Standards Branch investigation determined that London Police Service procedures related to the incident are in keeping with legislation and provide adequate and appropriate guidance to members.

With respect to the conduct of the designated officials, the investigation determined it to have complied with standards set out in the Community Safety and Policing Act and with London Police Service procedure.

PREPARED BY: Charlene Humble, Inspector – Professional Standards Branch



LONDON POLICE SERVICE

REPORT TO THE LONDON POLICE SERVICE BOARD

BOARD MEETING DATE: January 15, 2026
BOARD REPORT #: 2601EA03
MEETING: Open
CSPA SECTION: N/A

TO: Chair and Members of the London Police Service Board
FROM: Paul Bastien, Deputy Chief
SUBJECT: **Report on Investigation Pursuant to s. 81(1) CSPA
SIU Case 25-OCI-293 (Custody Injury)**
PURPOSE: Update / Information Purposes Only

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the London Police Service Board receive this report for the stated purpose.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS: (if applicable)

N/A

SUMMARY:

On November 6, 2025, the Special Investigations Unit closed an investigation into the actions of a sworn member of the London Police Service after an individual in the officer's custody sustained an injury presumed to be a "serious injury" as set out in the *Special Investigations Unit Act, 2019*.

The Director concluded that there was no basis upon which to believe that the officer committed a criminal offence and the matter was investigated by the LPS Professional Standards Branch as required by s. 81 of the *Community Safety and Policing Act, 2023*.

The PSB investigation found that the officer(s) involved¹ complied with standards of conduct and that relevant LPS procedures and policing provided by the LPS were adequate.

DISCUSSION:

Background

The CSPA requires that the Chief investigate officer conduct and the adequacy of relevant procedures and policing provided as they pertain to the incidents investigated under s. 15 of the SIU Act.² Pursuant to s. 81(4) of the Act, this is the Chief's report to the Board in respect of the

¹ An involved officer may be a "Subject Official" (if their conduct appears, in the opinion of the SIU Director, to have been the cause of the incident under investigation) or a "Witness Official" (if, in the opinion of the Director, the officer was involved in the incident but is not a Subject Official).

² SIU Director may cause an investigation to be conducted into any incident in which any of the following occurs, if the incident may have resulted from criminal conduct by an official: the death or serious injury of a person, the discharge of a firearm at a person, or the sexual assault of a person, as reported by the person.

investigation into the above-referenced incident, submitted in accordance with s. 8 of O. Reg. 90/24, CSPA and Board policy LPS-2-IAS-001.

Incident Summary

On July 26, 2025, officers engaged with an affected person at Victoria Park, 580 Clarence Street, London, to execute a Form 2 apprehension under the Mental Health Act. During the interaction, the subject official (SO1), assisted by two witness officials (WO1 and later WO2), attempted to remove the affected person from the driver's seat of a vehicle after repeated refusals to exit and attempts to restart the engine. The individual was taken into custody and transported to hospital, where a right clavicle fracture was subsequently identified, triggering SIU notification and mandate engagement.

Summary of Findings: Special Investigations Unit

The SIU determined that the affected person's injury occurred in the course of a lawful Form 2 apprehension and that the force used by SO1 and WO1 was reasonable and proportionate to the circumstances.

Investigative materials including body-worn camera, police records, and hospital documentation, supported that officers first attempted verbal resolution, then used grappling and grounding tactics to remove the individual from a running vehicle without delivering strikes; the grounding was assessed as a measured tactic to manage ongoing resistance safely.

Applying Criminal Code s.25(1) (protection of persons acting under authority), the Director found no reasonable grounds to believe any criminal offence was committed by the subject official; no charges were laid and the file was closed on November 6, 2025.

Summary of Findings: LPS Professional Standards Branch

The internal review concluded that SO1, WO1, and WO2 acted within the Mental Health Act authority provided by the Form 2, and their use of force (communication, soft physical control, vehicle shut-off, removal, and grounding) was consistent with LPS Procedure AI-001.01 (Use of Force) and Criminal Code s.25(1).

Notification and cooperation requirements for SIU incidents were met in accordance with AD-002.01, including timely escalation and documentation.

The administrative review identified no procedural deficiencies or training gaps related to mental-health apprehensions, SIU notifications, or use-of-force reporting; officers demonstrated adherence to LE-011.01 (Mental Health Crisis Response), including transport to hospital and transfer of custody. Given the absence of conduct or procedural non-compliance, no corrective actions were recommended; required use-of-force reports and SIU liaison steps were completed.

CONCLUSION:

The Professional Standards Branch investigation determined that London Police Service procedures related to the incident are in keeping with legislation and provide adequate and appropriate guidance to members.

With respect to the conduct of the designated officials, the investigation determined it to have complied with standards set out in the Community Safety and Policing Act and with London Police Service procedure.

PREPARED BY: Charlene Humble, Inspector – Professional Standards Branch



LONDON POLICE SERVICE

REPORT TO THE LONDON POLICE SERVICE BOARD

BOARD MEETING DATE: January 15, 2026
BOARD REPORT #: 2601EA04
MEETING: Open
CSPA SECTION: N/A

TO: Chair and Members of the London Police Service Board
FROM: Paul Bastien, Deputy Chief
SUBJECT: **Report on Investigation Pursuant to s. 81(1) CSPA
SIU Case 25-OCI-313 (Custody Injury)**
PURPOSE: Update / Information Purposes Only

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the London Police Service Board receive this report for the stated purpose.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS: (if applicable)

N/A

SUMMARY:

On November 10, 2025, the Special Investigations Unit closed an investigation into the actions of a sworn member of the London Police Service after an individual in the officer's custody sustained an injury presumed to be a "serious injury" as set out in the *Special Investigations Unit Act, 2019*. The Director concluded that there was no basis upon which to believe that the officer committed a criminal offence and the matter was investigated by the LPS Professional Standards Branch as required by s. 81 of the *Community Safety and Policing Act, 2023*. The PSB investigation found that the officer(s) involved¹ complied with standards of conduct and that relevant LPS procedures and policing provided by the LPS were adequate.

DISCUSSION:

Background

The CSPA requires that the Chief investigate officer conduct and the adequacy of relevant procedures and policing provided as they pertain to the incidents investigated under s. 15 of the SIU Act.² Pursuant to s. 81(4) of the Act, this is the Chief's report to the Board in respect of the investigation into the above-referenced incident, submitted in accordance with s. 8 of O. Reg. 90/24, CSPA and Board policy LPS-2-IAS-001.

¹ An involved officer may be a "Subject Official" (if their conduct appears, in the opinion of the SIU Director, to have been the cause of the incident under investigation) or a "Witness Official" (if, in the opinion of the Director, the officer was involved in the incident but is not a Subject Official).

² SIU Director may cause an investigation to be conducted into any incident in which any of the following occurs, if the incident may have resulted from criminal conduct by an official: the death or serious injury of a person, the discharge of a firearm at a person, or the sexual assault of a person, as reported by the person.

Incident Summary

In the early morning of August 14, 2025, officers responded to a 911 report of a suspected break and enter at 101 Burnside Drive, London. Two individuals matching suspect descriptions provided by the caller were located nearby. When advised he was being detained, the Complainant attempted to flee on foot; the subject officer (SO1) conducted a brief foot pursuit and executed a takedown after only a few strides. The Complainant was handcuffed and transported to police headquarters.

While in custody, the Complainant appeared unwell and was transported to hospital, where medical staff diagnosed a fractured right clavicle. In keeping with notification requirements, the Special Investigations Unit (SIU) was contacted the same day and invoked its mandate to investigate a serious injury arising from police contact.

Summary of Findings: Special Investigations Unit

The SIU's Director assessed the incident under Criminal Code s.25(1) and case law governing investigative detention. The Director found no reasonable grounds to believe SO1 committed a criminal offence. Specifically, the Director concluded that SO1 had lawful grounds to detain the Complainant based on the proximity to the reported offence and matching descriptors, and that a takedown to prevent flight was a reasonable and proportionate tactic.

The injury (fractured clavicle) was accepted as having occurred during the takedown; however, the evidence found that the force used to control the Complainant and put him into a prone position with assistance from a witness officer to complete handcuffing was neither unlawful nor excessive.

Summary of Findings: LPS Professional Standards Branch

The internal investigation found that SO1's conduct throughout the incident was reasonable, necessary, and justified. SO1 initiated an investigative detention, pursued the Complainant when they attempted to flee, and used physical control to prevent escape. These actions were consistent with section 25(1) of the Criminal Code and aligned with the service's Use of Force guidance, specifically the Physical Control Options for active resistance.

After the Complainant exhibited dizziness and lost consciousness while in custody, officers adhered to the Medical Care of Persons in Custody procedure by promptly requesting paramedics and facilitating transport to the hospital. Additionally, the SIU Incidents procedure was properly followed, with supervisory personnel ensuring timely notification and invocation of the SIU mandate on the date of injury.

The review did not identify any gaps in training, procedures, or service delivery related to the detention, takedown, or post-custody medical response.

The conduct of SO1 and all involved witness officers was found to be consistent with policy and legislation and aligned with the independent findings of the SIU. No corrective actions were recommended.

CONCLUSION:

The Professional Standards Branch investigation determined that London Police Service procedures related to the incident were in keeping with legislation and otherwise provide adequate and appropriate guidance to members.

With respect to the conduct of the designated officials, the investigation determined it to have complied with standards set out in the Community Safety and Policing Act and with London Police Service procedure.

PREPARED BY: Charlene Humble, Inspector – Professional Standards Branch