



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-OCI-179)

.....

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

In the early morning of April 16, 2026, a Brantford Police Service officer was on patrol when he came upon a physical altercation involving two men in the area of King Street and Dalhousie Street. When one of the individuals fled, the officer pursued the 22-year-old man on foot. He was joined by a second officer. As the officers closed in, the man attempted to make his way onto the side of Art Stanbridge Walkway that connects the YMCA to the parking garage on Water Street. Due to the wet and slippery conditions, the man lost his footing and momentarily hung from the walkway's outer railing. An officer had just managed to grab the man's right hand but it slipped through his grasp. The man either jumped or fell several meters to the sidewalk below. He suffered serious injuries in the fall, including trauma to the head, a liver laceration and fractures of the femur, ulna, wrist and pelvis. The officers immediately began administering first aid until paramedics arrived to transport the male to the hospital.

The Special Investigations Unit (SIU) was contacted and initiated an investigation.

On his assessment of the evidence, SIU Director Joseph Martino determined there were no reasonable grounds to believe that an officer committed a criminal offence in connection with the man's fall and injuries.

The SIU Director stated:

"The Subject Official had come upon a physical altercation involving the Complainant and was within his rights in attempting to detain him for further investigation. Once it was apparent that he had placed himself in a very precarious position on the railing of a building,

the evidence indicates that the officer properly switched his focus to doing what he could to prevent harm coming to the Complainant, consistent with his duty to preserve and protect life.

It is also apparent on the evidence that the Subject Official and Witness Official #1 comported themselves at all times with due care and regard for the Complainant's safety. By the time they entered onto the rooftop and were still a distance from the Complainant, he was already attempting to climb onto the top of the half-wall at the southern edge of the building. This was never a static situation in which the officers might have opted to stand back and perhaps try to talk the Complainant to safety. Rather, events were happening quickly with the Complainant seemingly determined to make it onto the walkway from the half-wall. In the circumstances, I am satisfied the officers made a reasonable choice when they rushed towards the Complainant in an effort to grab hold of him and prevent his fall. In fact, the Subject Official did briefly make contact with the Complainant's right hand and conceivably could have held him up, with support from Witness Official #1, if it had not been for the wet and slippery conditions at the time.

For the foregoing reasons, there is no basis for proceeding with criminal charges in this case. The file is closed."

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.