



Summary of Investigation

SiRT File # 2025-0053

Referral from

RCMP Nova Scotia

May 23, 2025

Erin E. Nauss
Director
October 17, 2025

SiRT MANDATE

The Serious Incident Response Team (“SiRT”) has a mandate to investigate all matters that involve death, serious injury, sexual assault, intimate partner violence or other matters determined to be of a public interest to be investigated that may have arisen from the actions of any police officer in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. This mandate encompasses incidents that occur on or off-duty, to avoid the real or perceived bias of police investigating police.

At the conclusion of every investigation, the SiRT Director must determine if criminal charges should result from the actions of the police officer. If no charges are warranted the Director will issue a public summary of the investigation which outlines the reasons for that decision, which must include the information set out by regulation. Public summaries are drafted with the goal of adequate information to allow the public to understand the Director’s rationale and conclusions.

Mandate invoked: This investigation was authorized under Section 26I of *Police Act* as a matter in the public interest to be investigated.

Timeline & Delays: SiRT commenced its investigation on May 23, 2025. The investigation concluded on September 18, 2025. There was some delay related to receipt of medical records.

Terminology: This summary uses the following language in accordance with regulations made under the *Police Act* and to protect the privacy of those involved:

- **“Affected Party/AP”** means the person who died or was seriously injured in relation to a serious incident.
- **“Civilian Witness/CW”** means any non-police individual who is a witness to or has material information relating to a serious incident.
- **“Witness Officer/WO”** means any police officer who is a witness to or has material information relating to a serious incident.
- **“Subject Officer/SO”** means a police officer who is the subject of an investigation, or whose actions may have resulted in a serious incident.

Evidence: The decision summarized in this report is based on evidence collected and analyzed during the investigation, including, but not limited to, the following:

1. Civilian Witness Statements (4)
2. Statement of AP taken by Family and Children's Services
3. Statements of Civilian Witnesses taken by Family and Children's Services (6)
4. Witness Officer Notes (2)
5. Medical Records of the Affected Party
6. Family and Children's Services Staff Case Notes

INVESTIGATION SUMMARY

Privacy Interests

Subsection 9A (2) of the Serious Incident Response Team Regulations made under the Police Act states that “If the Director is of the opinion that a person’s privacy interest in not having some or all of the information or evidence described in clauses (1)(d) or (f) published outweighs the public interest in having the information or evidence published, the Director may omit that information or evidence from the report published under subsection (1) and must provide reasons for doing so.”

The present file involves a young person and the investigation examined the personal and private details of a family. Therefore, in order to protect the privacy interests of those involved in the investigation, some information collected in the investigation has been summarized or omitted.

Introduction

On May 23, 2025, the Kings District RCMP was contacted by a Child Protection Supervisor from the Department of Opportunities and Social Development Family and Children's Services. Officials from a local school had contacted Family and Children's Services to report that children had stated that their father, an RCMP officer, hurts them. The RCMP contacted SiRT that day and an investigation commenced.

On May 23, 2025, the SiRT Investigator spoke with Civilian Witness #1 (CW1), a social worker from Family and Children's Services. CW1 planned to attend the school and immediately interview the elementary aged child (the Affected Party/AP). The AP was alleged to have stated in class that the SO punches, hits, and throws them in the lake for punishment.

The AP's mother had picked up her two children, the AP and their older sibling, Civilian Witness #2 (CW2) from their schools. CW1 contacted the mother and interviewed her, the AP, and CW2. CW1 developed a safety plan.

AP and Family statement summaries

The AP's mother, Civilian Witness #3 (CW3) outlined family challenges and some of the issues they were experiencing with the AP. She explained that on one occasion the SO put the AP in about two inches of water in a lake as the AP was behaving violently and they wanted to snap them out of the erratic behaviour. She explained they are seeking medical treatment and assistance. There have been previous investigations related to statements the AP has made.

CW2 stated that they were aware of the AP's allegation but did not hear it directly as they were at school. CW2 stated that their father does not hit them, and that the AP can crash out and be angry and needs help.

The AP told CW1 that their teacher was mistaken and expressed remorse. The AP appeared concerned that their father would be angry. The AP did not make any statements about abuse or harm when speaking to the social worker. Their medical records were obtained by SiRT as part of the investigation, which outlined a history of behavioural concerns and ongoing care.

School officials statement summaries

The AP's substitute teacher (Civilian Witness #4/CW4) provided a statement about the incident that occurred on May 23, 2025. He described the AP becoming dysregulated in class after not being able to sit in a particular seat. The AP was repeatedly yelling and motioned to flip a table. After attempts to calm the AP down, CW4 suggested they may call their parents. The AP then made statements that their father, the SO, punches and hurts him. The AP also said their dad says he is going to throw them in the lake. CW4 brought the AP to the principal.

The principal from the AP's school (Civilian Witness #5/CW5) stated on May 23, 2025 the AP made a disclosure of abuse in class, and when she asked them about it, they relayed the same statements they had made to CW4. CW5 contacted Family and Children's Services, and the AP's mother (CW3). CW5 stated the AP was sad, sobbing, and upset and adamant that she call their mother and not father. When she contacted CW3, she was crying and became upset about how this would impact the family. CW5 stated she called the SO once the AP had been picked up, and he was unhappy she had reported this incident to Family and Children's Services.

Police Officers

The notes and reports of two Witness Officers who responded to the initial complaint were obtained and reviewed by SiRT as part of the investigation. The reports are consistent with the call from the school to Family and Children's Services.

SOs are not required by law to provide notes or reports or consent to an interview. In this matter, the SO declined to provide a statement to SiRT.

LEGAL ISSUES & ANALYSIS

I must now assess the evidence to determine whether there are reasonable and probable grounds to believe the criminal offence of assault has been committed. Reasonable and probable grounds is a standard lower than a balance of probabilities or beyond a reasonable doubt, and more than reasonable suspicion.

Allegations of this nature are very serious and if there is evidence to indicate an assault has occurred a charge must be laid, regardless of the wishes of an affected party. However, a review of the evidence collected in this investigation does not support a determination that there are reasonable and probable grounds to believe a criminal offence has taken place. Initial comments were made by the AP at school, but they subsequently stated their teacher had misunderstood and expressed remorse for those statements. CW2 and CW3 explained some of the issues taking place within the family, and there is nothing to substantiate the statements made in class by the AP. The evidence shows that the family has been struggling with the AP's behavioural issues and are seeking care to address them. The AP and the family are being provided ongoing support and oversight through Family and Children's Services.

CONCLUSION

After a careful review of the evidence and the law, I have determined that there are no reasonable grounds to lay a charge against the SO.