



BOARD REPORT

To: Chair and Members
Brantford Police Services Board

From: Inspector Kevin Reeder

Date: August 12, 2026

Subject: Report on Section 81(1) Investigation (SIU)
(SIU# 26-OSA-171)

.....

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Board accepts this report as required under the *Community Safety and Policing Act*, and

THAT the Board directs the Chief of Police to post this report on the internet within 30 days of receiving the report.

BACKGROUND:

Section 81(1) of the *Community Safety and Policing Act* directs that if the SIU Director causes an incident to be investigated under Section 15 of the *Special Investigations Unit Act, 2019* involving a member of a police service, other than a Deputy Chief of Police, the Chief of Police of the police service shall investigate:

- (a) the member's conduct in relation to the incident;
- (b) the policing provided by the member in relation to the incident; and
- (c) the procedures established by the chief of police as they related to the incident.

The Chief of Police shall report the findings and any action taken or recommendations based on the findings of the Section 81(1) investigation to the Police Service Board.

Section 8(3) of Ontario Regulation 90/24 directs that a Chief of Police who is required to report on an investigation under Section 81(1) shall give the report to the Police Service Board. If no criminal charges are laid against a member of the police service, the report shall be given within 90 days after the SIU Director publishes a final report.

Section 8(5) of Ontario Regulation 90/24 directs that a Police Service Board shall publish the report on the internet no later than 30 days after receiving the report.

Summary of SIU Incident

On January 30, 2026 a male and female were intoxicated and became involved in an argument with their Uber driver. Police were called, separated the parties and investigated the disturbance. Later that day the female filed a complaint with the Law Enforcement Complaints Agency (LECA) against the officers.

The next day, on January 31, 2026 the investigating officer formed reasonable grounds to arrest and charge the female for mischief under \$5,000 for throwing her coffee on the Uber driver's car. The officer contacted the female and requested she attend the station to be arrested. At 12:14PM the female was arrested at the police station by the female officer. The female was arrested, searched and released from custody with a court date.

On March 5, 2026 LECA screened the female's complaint out due to the outstanding criminal proceedings.

On April 9, 2026 the female's partner left a voicemail for the investigating officer demanding an apology for charging his girlfriend and made an allegation that the officer had sexually assaulted his girlfriend. A Sergeant was sent to speak with the male and female. During that conversation, the female made an allegation that the female officer had grabbed her inappropriately during the search and thus had sexually assaulted her. The female said she was a survivor of sexual assault.

The search was captured on the officer's body worn camera and cameras at the police station.

The Special Investigations Unit (SIU) was contacted due to the allegation of sexual assault and initiated an investigation.

The SIU Director closed the investigation with no further action and reported:

“On my assessment of the evidence, there are no reasonable grounds to believe that the SO committed a criminal offence in connection with the complaint of sexual assault.

A sexual assault consists of an assault within any of its definitions in the Criminal Code that is sexual in nature and violates the sexual integrity of the victim: R. v. Chase, [1987] 2 SCR 293.

The Complainant asserts that the SO inappropriately touched her vagina over her clothing in the course of the pat-down search at the station. The SO denies that she did so. According to the officer, her hand was never closer than about “four inches” from the Complainant’s crotch area. The video evidence is not definitive one way or the other as it did not capture the activity in question. It did record audio in which the Complainant expressed concern about certain contact during the search. The SO replied that the search would be “easier” if the Complainant widened her stance. On this record, with no reason to believe that the Complainant’s version of events is any likelier to be closer to the truth than the SO’s account, I am unable to reasonably conclude that the officer touched the Complainant in a sexual manner in the way described by the Complainant.

For the foregoing reasons, there is no basis for proceeding with criminal charges in this case.”

Findings of the Section 81 Investigation

The ensuing Section 81(1) investigation looked at the officer's conduct, the service provided and any deficiencies or violations of policy and procedure.

The investigator found no deficiencies with the policies and procedures or services provided by members of the Brantford Police Service.

Further, there was no evidence discovered that suggested members committed misconduct or unsatisfactory work performance.

As a result, no further action is recommended to be taken.