



11-04-26

REPORT

Peel Police Service Board

For Information

File Class: 1-01-02-01

Cross-Reference File Class: _____

Date: **April 7, 2026**

Subject: **2025 CORPORATE RISK MANAGEMENT ANNUAL PUBLIC REPORT**

From: **Nishan Duraiappah, Chief of Police**

Recommendation

It is recommended that this document be received as the 2025 Corporate Risk Management Annual Public Report.

REPORT HIGHLIGHTS

- Investigative Support Bureau (I.S.B.)
- *Police Service Act (P.S.A.)* now under the *Community Safety and Policing Act (C.S.P.A.)* Discipline Offences
- Public Complaints

Discussion

The purpose of this report provides transparency for the public, as well as satisfies annual legislated reporting to the Peel Police Service Board (P.P.S.B.). This report contains data as it relates to risk management within the Professional Standards Bureau.

1. Investigative Support Bureau (I.S.B.)

The Special Investigations Unit (S.I.U.) is a civilian law enforcement agency that investigates incidents involving police officers where there has been death, serious injury or allegations of sexual assault. The Unit's jurisdiction covers more than 50 municipal, regional and provincial police services across Ontario. Previously under the *Police Services Act (P.S.A.)*, and now under the *Community Safety and Policing Act (C.S.P.A.)*, the Director of the S.I.U. must determine, based on the evidence gathered in an investigation, whether an officer has committed a criminal offence in connection with the incident under investigation. If, after an investigation, there are reasonable grounds to believe that an offence was committed, the Director has the authority to lay a criminal charge against the officer. Alternatively, in all cases where no reasonable grounds exist, the Director does not lay criminal charges but files a report with the Attorney General (A.G.) communicating the results of an investigation.

The I.S.B. shall:

- a. Be designated as the policy centre for S.I.U. matters in order to maximize efficiency and consistency of operation
- b. Conduct the administrative investigation for the purpose of reviewing procedures, processes and practices of Peel Regional Police (P.R.P.) in relation to all incidents under investigation by the S.I.U.
- c. Direct the investigation into the criminal conduct of any person injured in the occurrence, who forms the basis of the S.I.U. investigation.

The following statistics relate to incidents involving members of P.R.P. in which the S.I.U. became involved. These statistics are shown in comparison with those captured at year-end of 2024 and 2023. Billing and remuneration by finance typically transpire at the completion of an investigation, however some legal firms opt to submit billing upon completion of the involved member's interview with the S.I.U.

Investigations	2025	2024	2023
S.I.U. Investigations	27	32	34
Subject Official Designations	30	35	36
Witness Official Designations	49	76	119
Total Legal Expenses	\$176,086.14	\$358,664.22	\$266,237.70
Disposition of Cases			
Case closed: No further action	16	28	20
Cases involving other police services	3	5	3
Investigations terminated	3	2	5
Cases where charges laid	0	2	1
Investigations ongoing	9	13	14

Conclusion

The S.I.U. became involved in a total of 27 P.R.P. incidents in 2025. The S.I.U. closed 16 investigations indicating that there would be "no further action" as the officers were cleared of any criminal liability. They terminated three (3) investigations based on evidence showing that the injuries were not as serious as first believed, loss of jurisdiction or that the P.R.P. member was not directly involved.

Nine (9) investigations are currently ongoing. There were three (3) incidents where members of the I.S.B. were required to liaise with the S.I.U. for incidents that involved members from other police services. Two (2) P.R.P. members were designated as Witness Officials (W.O.) in two (2) of the cases and the third case did not require P.R.P. officers to be designated.

Nine (9) S.I.U. investigations migrated from 2024 into the 2025 calendar year. Seven (7) of those cases were closed with "no further action" and the remaining two (2) were terminated due to loss of jurisdiction or S.I.U. mandate.

A total of 79 officers were designated in 2025 – 30 as Subject Officials (S.O.) and 49 as W.O.s. Legal representation was requested by and provided for the designated officials.

The total legal expenses incurred to date are \$176,086.14.

2. P.S.A./C.S.P.A. Discipline Offences

On April 1, 2024, the C.S.P.A. replaced the former P.S.A. and now governs all police services across Ontario. The C.S.P.A. establishes standards of professional conduct and accountability, including the definition of police misconduct under section 195, and sets out requirements for the reporting and disclosure of misconduct, including protections against reprisal, under sections 183 and 184. The following section outlines incidents completed in 2025 that were assessed and addressed in accordance with the P.S.A. and C.S.P.A. and its associated regulations.

A total of three (3) P.S.A. investigations and a total of nine (9) C.S.P.A. investigations were resolved during the course of 2025.

The following is the disposition of the P.S.A. matters:

- a. **Summary of Offences:** The officer utilized confidential information obtained through his position as a P.R.P. member to benefit a relative, a suspect under investigation by the Fraud Bureau. Based on the information, the suspect was able to flee the country and avoid arrest. The officer was charged with Discreditable Conduct and pled guilty.

Disposition: Forfeiture of 120 hours pay. (15 days)

- b. **Summary of Offences:** The officer responded to a 911 call for a male that was out of control at a residence. The male party suffered serious injuries as a result of an interaction with the officer. The officer was charged criminally by S.I.U. The officer was later charged with Discreditable Conduct and Unlawful or Unnecessary Exercise of Authority and plead guilty to both.

Disposition: Reduction in rank from First Class Constable to Second Class Constable for a period of 18 months following which, the officer will be returned to the rank of First Class Constable on the basis of satisfactory work performance to be determined by the officer's Divisional Commander and training pertaining to de-escalation in mental health apprehensions.

- c. **Summary of Offences:** While off-duty the officer was involved in a Motor Vehicle Collision (M.V.C.) and left the scene without exchanging information. Police attended the officer's residence where the officer was charged criminally. The officer plead guilty to Careless Driving contrary to section 130(1) of the *Highway Traffic Act (H.T.A.)*. Subsequently the officer was charged with Discreditable Conduct and pled guilty.

Disposition: Reduction in rank from First Class Constable to Second Class Constable for a period of 12 months following which, the officer will be returned to the rank of First Class Constable on the basis of satisfactory work performance to be determined by the officer's Divisional Commander.

The following is the disposition of the C.S.P.A. matters:

- d. **Summary of Offence:** While off-duty, the officer's vehicle was observed parked in a live lane for approximately 10 minutes. Police were contacted and attended the scene where they found the officer asleep while occupying the driver's seat of the vehicle. The officer was arrested and charged with impaired related offences. The officer was served a 90-day Automatic Drivers Licence Suspension (A.D.L.S.), and his vehicle was impounded for seven (7) days. The officer plead guilty to the offence

of Operation While Impaired – Alcohol, contrary to Section 320.14(1)(a) of the *Criminal Code of Canada*. The charge of Operation While Impaired – blood alcohol concentration, was withdrawn. The officer received a sentence including a 12-month driving prohibition as well as a \$2,300 fine and \$690 victim surcharge. The officer was charged under the *C.S.P.A.* with Misconduct and plead guilty.

Disposition: Reduction in rank from First Class Constable to Second Class Constable for a period of 12 months following which the officer will be returned to the rank of First Class Constable on the basis of satisfactory work performance to be determined by the officer's Divisional Commander.

- e. **Summary of Offence:** The officer was responding to a medical assistance call in a fully marked police cruiser. As the officer approached an intersection, a civilian vehicle was in the intersection waiting to turn left. The civilian vehicle turned left in front of the officer's vehicle and a collision occurred. The officer and the civilian were transported to the hospital where they received medical treatment. The civilian sustained a fractured left shoulder, a fractured left wrist, a fractured left ankle and minor abdominal bleed. The S.I.U. charged the officer with one (1) count of Dangerous Driving Causing Bodily Harm. The officer plead guilty, he was sentenced to a one (1) year *H.T.A.* driving prohibition and a \$4,550 fine. The officer was charged under the *C.S.P.A.* with Misconduct and plead guilty to the charge.

Disposition: Reduction in rank from First Class Constable to Second Class Constable for a period of three months, following which the officer will be returned to the rank of First Class Constable, on the basis of satisfactory work performance to be determined by the Service, pursuant to section 202(9)3 of the *C.S.P.A.*

- f. **Summary of Offence:** The officer failed to report for their regularly scheduled day shift. When attempts to contact the officer by phone were unsuccessful, a supervisor was assigned to attend the officer's residence to check on his well being. The officer was not present at the residence when the supervisors attended at approximately 8:36 a.m. At 12:46 p.m. the officer called 11 Division to report off sick. The officer called from a phone number with a Colorado area code. They advised the Constable working the front desk they would be off sick as the Acting Staff Sergeant was unavailable to take the call. At 11:37 p.m. the officer attempted to call in sick for the following day shift. They called from the same Colorado phone number and spoke with the Cadet working the front desk. They were advised to call back as the Staff Sergeant was unavailable. Approximately 45 minutes later, the officer called back from a phone number with a 905-area code and spoke with the Acting Staff Sergeant. They advised they were at home sick and would not be attending for their day shift that morning. The following day, when the officer arrived at work for their regularly scheduled night shift, the Acting Staff Sergeant questioned them about their failure to follow proper procedure with respect to calling in sick. The Acting Staff Sergeant also questioned the officer about the suspicious circumstances surrounding their absence from work the previous two (2) days. The officer insisted they were home sick, however he could not provide a reasonable explanation for why they called in sick from a phone number with a Colorado area code. The officer was charged under the *C.S.P.A.* with Misconduct in that they contravened their prescribed code of conduct and plead guilty.

Disposition: Reduction in rank from First Class Constable to the rank of Second Class Constable for 12 months with a return to rank after the conclusion of the 12 months demotion period, pursuant to section 202(9)3 of the *C.S.P.A.*

g. Summary of Offence: While off-duty, the officer was operating their vehicle travelling on Highway 401 in the City of Milton. The officer lost control of their vehicle and struck the attenuator at the start of the guardrail where the express and collector lanes split. Ontario Provincial Police (O.P.P.) officers arrived on scene and observed the officer displaying obvious signs of impairment. The officer was subsequently placed under arrest for Impaired Operation of a Motor Vehicle and transported to a detachment. The officer provided two (2) samples of breath for analysis which registered over the legal limit and was advised of the additional charge of Excess Blood Alcohol. The officer suffered minor bruises and abrasions as a result of the M.V.C., however, a dog that was also in the vehicle, died as a result of the incident. Prior to his first appearance date, the officer appeared before an honorable Justice in an Ontario Court of Justice. They plead guilty to Operation of Motor Vehicle with Excess Blood Alcohol, contrary to section 320.14(1)(b) of the *Criminal Code of Canada*. The officer received a sentence which included a \$3,000 fine and a 12-month driving prohibition. The officer did not attempt to use their position as a police officer to gain any consideration during the incident. The officer took accountability for their actions by pleading guilty at the earliest opportunity. The officer was charged under the *C.S.P.A.* with Misconduct and plead guilty to the charge.

Disposition: Reduction in rank from First Class Constable to the rank of Second Class Constable for 20 months with a return to rank after the conclusion of the 20 months demotion period, pursuant to section 202(9)3 of the *C.S.P.A.*

h. Summary of Offence: While off-duty, the officer was operating a motor vehicle in the City of Toronto. The officer was the registered owner of the vehicle and was the lone occupant. The officer collided with an unoccupied parked vehicle. A witness called 911 and advised the call taker that the officer “sideswiped a parked car” and that the driver “seemed out of it as if they were intoxicated or injured”. Officers arrived on scene and were advised by paramedics that the officer had been medically cleared, however, wanted to remain seated inside the ambulance for unknown reasons, therefore, officers spoke with the officer in the back of the ambulance. The officer appeared confused, and when asked to produce their Ontario driver’s licence, handed over their Ontario health card. When asked what happened regarding the collision, the officer spoke incoherently and stated that “there was a guy, then there was a call for another guy, and then they didn’t know as they were just trying to focus on getting to work”. The officer was placed under arrest for Impaired Operation of a Conveyance by alcohol or drug. The officer was read a Drug Recognition Evaluation (D.R.E.) demand and agreed to comply with the demand. The officer was transported to Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) Traffic Services where the D.R.E. was conducted by a qualified evaluating officer. The evaluating officer advised that the officer performed poorly and was therefore charged with Impaired Operation of a Conveyance. The officer plead guilty to the offence of Impaired Operation of a Conveyance by alcohol or drug. The officer received a sentence including a 12-month driving prohibition as well as a \$1,000 fine. The officer was charged under the *C.S.P.A.* with Misconduct and plead guilty to the charge.

Disposition: Reduction in rank from Third Class Constable to Fourth Class Constable for two (2) additional years, commencing on the date of the agreement, prior to being eligible for reclassification to the next rank of Third Class Constable, on the basis of satisfactory work performance to be determined by the Service, pursuant to section 202(9)3 of the *C.S.P.A.* Further, the agreement will constitute notice of the reasons for non-reclassification at the normal time for the purposes of Article 13.03 of the Uniform Collective Agreement.

i. Summary of Offence: The officer was off-duty when a Waterloo Regional Police Service (W.R.P.S.) officer observed a vehicle parked beside Picard's Peanuts. He approached the vehicle to check on

the well-being of the occupants. The W.R.P.S. officer located the officer sitting in the passenger seat of the vehicle and noticed a smell of alcohol emanating from inside the vehicle. The officer indicated they had consumed alcohol earlier in the evening. The W.R.P.S. officer demanded that they provide a sample of breath into the Approved Screening Device (A.S.D.). The officer advised that they understood the procedures and identified themselves as a police officer with P.R.P. The officer was placed under arrest for failing to provide a breath sample into an A.S.D. Moments later, the officer indicated that they would provide a breath sample. The officer provided a suitable breath sample, which registered a "fail" on the A.S.D. The officer was transported to the W.R.P.S. Central Division Cellblock, where they provided two (2) samples of breath for analysis. The officer was subsequently released from custody on an Undertaking for the criminal charges of Operation While Impaired Alcohol and Operation While Impaired Blood Alcohol Concentration. The officer's counsel plead guilty on behalf of the officer for careless driving, contrary to section 130 of the *H.T.A.* The officer received a \$1,250 fine. Although the officer identified themselves as a police officer, they did not attempt to use their position to gain any consideration during the incident. During their compelled interview, the officer was remorseful and took responsibility for the incident. The officer was charged under the *C.S.P.A.* with Misconduct and plead guilty.

Disposition: Reduction in rank from First Class Constable to Second Class Constable for a period of 11 months, following which the officer will be returned to the rank of First Class Constable, pursuant to section 202(9)3 of the *C.S.P.A.*

- j. **Summary of Offence:** While off-duty, the officer was operating their vehicle in Hamilton, at a high rate of speed. Police measured the speed of the vehicle to be 93 km/hr in a posted 60 km/hr zone. Hamilton Police Service (H.P.S.) initiated a traffic stop and spoke with the driver. The driver provided their Ontario driver's licence and proof of insurance. After returning to the vehicle, police detected an odour of an alcohol on the officer's breath. The officer denied consuming any alcohol. The officer was read the A.S.D. demand. At that time, they provided an unsuitable blow and provided a second sample on the A.S.D. which registered as a "fail". The officer was placed under arrest for operating a conveyance with more than 80 mg of alcohol in 100 ml of blood. The officer was read the breath demand and was transported to H.R.P. Station 30 for alcohol testing and provided two (2) suitable samples. The officer was served with the appropriate notices and documents. The officer was released on a Form 10 undertaking for operation while impaired (alcohol) equal to or exceeds 80mg/100ml - contrary to section 320.14(1)(b) of the *Criminal Code of Canada*. The officer was charged under the *C.S.P.A.* with Misconduct and plead guilty.

Disposition: Reduction in rank from Second Class Constable to Third Class Constable for one (1) year and five (5) months, following which they should be returned to the previous rank of Second Class Constable.

- k. **Summary of Offence:** The officer was off-duty and attended the Hindu Sabah Temple as part of a large group of Khalistan protesters, peacefully protesting while standing on the sidewalk outside of the temple gates. An on-duty officer working a paid duty immediately recognized the officer amongst the group of protestors. Approximately 30 minutes after the group of protestors arrived, several individuals exited the temple and approached the protestors. Tensions escalated between the two (2) groups and numerous physical altercations broke out resulting in additional police resources being required. After several hours, the assembly was declared unlawful, and all parties were ordered to disperse. Following the incident numerous videos and photos began to circulate on news outlets and social media of the officer involved in a physical confrontation with a member of the Hindu Sabah

Temple. Media outlets identified the officer as an off-duty P.R.P. officer. The P.R.P. Internal Affairs (I.A.) Bureau subsequently commenced an investigation into the conduct of the officer. I.A. investigators received information regarding a second political protest attended by the officer. A video of the protest was posted on social media which showed the officer and other protestors standing on the Indian flag while protesting outside of the Indian High Commission in the City of Toronto. The officer was charged under the *C.S.P.A.* with Misconduct and was found guilty at the conclusion of a hearing. The officer is appealing the finding.

Disposition: Reduction in rank from Sergeant to First Class Constable for a period of six (6) months, following which the officer will be returned to the rank of Sergeant on the basis of satisfactory work performance determined by the officers Divisional/District Commander.

I. Summary of Offence: While engaged in proactive policing, officers observed a running, white U-Haul van parked in the Bramalea City Centre underground parking lot, with a male asleep in the passenger seat. Believing the van may have been stolen, officers requested additional units. The officer positioned their marked cruiser in front of the van to block forward movement, while other officers deployed a stop stick behind the rear wheels. The van was also backed against a wall, restricting its ability to maneuver. The male awoke, moved into the driver's seat, and reversed the van, narrowly missing two (2) officers. He then accelerated forward, ramming the officer's cruiser in an apparent attempt to flee. The male continued alternating between forward and reverse, repeatedly striking the cruiser, colliding with an occupied civilian vehicle, and reversing into a wall. The officer repositioned their cruiser and pinned the van against the wall to stop further movement. Two (2) officers approached and removed the male from the van. During the arrest, the male resisted and was taken to the ground, striking his face and later reporting eye pain. He was handcuffed with his hands to the rear. While the male was under control, the officer exited his cruiser and struck him twice on the back of the head.

The male complained of head pain and was transported to Brampton Civic Hospital (B.C.H.), where diagnostic imaging confirmed a fractured cheekbone. The S.I.U. invoked its mandate and charged the officer with one (1) count of assault. The officer plead guilty to assault contrary to section 266 of the *Criminal Code of Canada*. As part of an agreed statement of facts, the Crown and Defence agreed the male's injuries were not caused by the officer's strikes. The officer received a conditional discharge and a 12-month probation. The officer was charged under the *C.S.P.A.* with Misconduct and plead guilty.

Disposition: Reduction in rank from First Class Constable to Second Class Constable for a period of three (3) months following which the officer will be returned to the rank of First Class Constable on the basis of satisfactory work performance to be determined by the officer's Divisional Commander pursuant to section 202(9)3 of the *C.S.P.A.*

The following *P.S.A.* & *C.S.P.A.* investigation statistics provides an annual comparison:

2021	2022	2023	2024	2025 (PSA&CSPA)
16	7	11	9	12
11 avg.				

3. Public Complaints

On April 1st, 2024, the *C.S.P.A.* replaced the former *P.S.A.* which resulted in the Law Enforcement Complaints Agency (L.E.C.A.) replacing the Office of Independent Police Review Director (O.I.P.R.D.).

The public complaint process in 2025 was the first full year governed under *C.S.P.A.* and is the sixteenth full year for statistics in which the public complaint process has been governed by provincial mandate. Statistics for this year's complaints are categorized as follows:

- a. Conduct of officers;
- b. Policies of the police service; or
- c. Services provided by the police service

Analysis

In 2025, the Public Complaints Investigation Bureau received 110 conduct complaints from L.E.C.A. This represents a 26.4% increase from the 87 complaints received in 2024. Compared to a five (5) year average of 97.6 per calendar year. In 2025, there was an increase of 12.71% over the five (5) year average.

L.E.C.A. retained zero (0) complaints for investigation in 2025, which was the same in 2024. L.E.C.A. assigned two (2) investigations in 2025 to an external police service to investigate, compared to zero (0) in 2024. P.R.P. retained one (1) investigation in 2025 from an outside agency, compared to zero (0) in 2024.

There were zero (0) conduct complaint investigations that resulted in discipline in 2025, which was the same in 2024.

There was one (1) service/policy complaint in 2025, compared to 10 in 2024. This decrease could be attributed to the implementation of the Inspectorate of Policing (I.O.P.) who's primary focus is to improve sector performance and accountability by ensuring compliance with Ontario's policing legislation and regulations. In 2025, Public Complaints assisted the I.O.P. with eight (8) investigations. Assistance in these investigations is primarily sending disclosure to the I.O.P. investigator.

There were 260 administrative files sent to P.R.P. from L.E.C.A. in 2025, compared to 210 in 2024. These complaint files have been deemed by L.E.C.A. as being frivolous, vexatious, made in bad faith, more appropriately dealt with by another Act or law, past the legislative time limit to be investigated or not in the public interest to proceed.

There were four (4) Local Response agreements in 2025, compared to two (2) in 2024. A Local Response is when a citizen chooses to go directly to the police service with a complaint and has come to an agreement about how to resolve the complaint informally.

The Early Resolution program provides an opportunity for complainants and respondent officers to voluntarily resolve complaints before they are formally screened under the *C.S.P.A.* In 2025, there were 23 Early Resolution agreements assigned, compared to 13 in 2024.

Complaints	2025	2024	2023	2022	2021
Administration File	260	210	170	133	181
Public Complaint	110	87	91	97	103
Service/Policy Complaints	1	10	23	8	4
Local Resolution/Local Response	4	2	5	3	6
Early Resolution	23	13	23	19	16
External Complaint	1	0	1	2	4
Total	399	322	313	262	314

Finally, as of December 31, 2025, the Public Complaints Investigation Bureau had 44 open/ongoing investigations, and there were zero (0) open/ongoing investigations that were previously retained by L.E.C.A.

Active/Open Investigations	2025	2024	2023	2022	2021
Total	44	26	33	34	34

Dispositions of Completed Investigations – Five (5) Year Trend

97.5% of all Public Complaints received in the last five (5) years have resulted in Informal Resolutions, Unsubstantiated or Withdrawn. The “Other” category includes Frivolous, Abandoned, Loss of Jurisdiction, Terminated, No misconduct, Unfounded and Past Time Limit.

Disposition	2025	2024	2023	2022	2021
Informal Resolutions	48	43	36	32	52
Unsubstantiated	24	16	18	21	20
Withdrawn	18	27	21	44	26
Other	3	6	8	5	7
Substantiated	0	0	8	1	3
Total	93	92	91	103	108

1. Strategic Plan Alignment

Goal:

Objective:

Conclusion

P.R.P. are transparent in the reporting of matters investigated by the Professional Standards Bureau. Incidents are thoroughly investigated and appropriate action is taken to mitigate further risk to the organization.

Approved for Submission



Nishan Duraiappah, Chief of Police

For further information regarding this report, please contact Staff Superintendent Martin Ottaway at extension 4004 or via email at 1872@peelpolice.ca.

Authored By: Inspector Matt Hutchinson #2079



08-06-26
REPORT

Peel Police Service Board

For Information

File Class: 1-01-02-01

Cross-Reference File Class: _____

Date: **June 9, 2026**

Subject: **SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT TO THE 2025 CORPORATE RISK MANAGEMENT ANNUAL PUBLIC REPORT**

From: **Nishan Duraiappah, Chief of Police**

Recommendation

It is recommended that this document be received as a supplementary report follow up to the 2025 Corporate Risk Management Annual Public Report.

REPORT HIGHLIGHTS

- *Police Service Act (P.S.A.)* now under the *Community Safety and Policing Act (C.S.P.A.)* Discipline Offences – Supplementary Report Statistical Data 2025

Discussion

The purpose of this report provides transparency for the public, as well as satisfies annual legislated reporting to the Peel Police Service Board (P.P.S.B.). This report contains additional data related to discipline offences under the *C.S.P.A.* completed in 2025.

Statistical Data 2025

Summary Overview

Total number of officers disciplined: **26**

Total number of disciplinary measures imposed: **29**

Number imposed without a hearing: **10**

Number imposed following a hearing: **1**

Number imposed following a Section 202 hearing (Demotion or termination): **9**

Number of imposed following a Section 85(8) hearing (*P.S.A.*): **4**

Number of imposed without a Section 85(8) hearing (*P.S.A.* informal 76(12)): **5**

Disciplinary Measures by Code of Conduct Provision (O. Reg. 407/23)

Breach of Code of Conduct: 14

- Eight (8) Demotion (C.S.P.A. Section 202 hearing)
- Six (6) Discipline Review Committee (D.R.C.) assessed penalty (Section 200 without a hearing)
 - Two (2) reprimand
 - Four (4) forfeiture of hours (40, 48, 100, 120)

Discreditable Conduct: 5

- Two (2) Demotion (P.S.A. Section 85(8) hearing)
 - One (1) demotion with de-escalation in mental health apprehension training
- One (1) forfeiture of hours (P.S.A. Section 85(8) hearing) (120)
- Two (2) D.R.C. assessed penalty (Section 85(8) without a hearing)
 - Two (2) forfeiture of hours (24,80)

Interactions with the Public: 2

- Two (2) D.R.C. assessed penalty (Section 200 without a hearing)
 - Two (2) forfeiture of hours (24, 32)

Neglect of Duty & Insubordination: 1

- One (1) D.R.C. assessed penalty (Section 85(8) without a hearing)
 - One (1) forfeiture of hours [eight (8)] and Policy Review

Performance of Duties: 3

- One (1) Demotion and Emotional Quotient Assessment and Coaching (C.S.P.A. Section 202 hearing)
- Two (2) D.R.C. assessed penalty (Section 200 without a hearing)
 - Two (2) forfeiture of hours [eight (8), 80]

Unlaw/Unnecessary Exercise Of Authority: 1

- One (1) D.R.C. assessed penalty (Section 85(8) without a hearing)
 - One (1) forfeiture of hours (24)

Method of Disposition

Discipline imposed under Section 200 without a hearing: **10**

Discipline imposed under Section 200 following a s. 201 hearing: **1**

Discipline imposed following a Section 202 hearing: **9**

Discipline imposed following a Section 85(8) hearing (P.S.A.): **4**

Discipline imposed without a Section 85(8) hearing (P.S.A. informal 76(12)): **5**

Time-Based Disciplinary Measures

Suspension without pay — Total: **0** Average: **0**

Forfeit of pay — Total: **540** Average: **60**

Forfeit of time off — Total: **128** Average: **21.3**

40 hours excluded: no penalty election received for member on leave.

Outcomes of Prior No-Hearing Discipline

Number upheld: **N/A**

Number varied: **N/A**

Number overturned: **N/A**

Impact on prior reports: **N/A**

Detachment or Sub-Unit Breakdown

Divisions:

- 11 Division: **4**
- 12 Division: **4**
- 21 Division: **8**
- 22 Division: **3**
- Airport Division: **2**

Community Safety Well Being Command:

- Training: **1**
- Divisional Mobilization Unit: **1**
- Incident Response Training: **2**

Investigative and Emergency Services Command:

- Extortion Investigative Task Force: **1**

Conclusion

P.R.P. is transparent in the reporting of matters investigated by the Professional Standards Bureau. Incidents are thoroughly investigated and appropriate action is taken to mitigate further risk to the organization.

Approved for Submission



Nishan Duraiappah, Chief of Police

For further information regarding this report, please contact Staff Superintendent Martin Ottaway at extension 4004 or via email at 1872@peelpolice.ca.

Authored By: Inspector Matthew Hutchinson