



Summary of Investigation

SiRT File # 2025-0142

Referral from

RCMP Nova Scotia

November 30, 2025

Erin E. Nauss
Director
July 31, 2026

SiRT MANDATE

The Serious Incident Response Team (“SiRT”) has a mandate to investigate all matters that involve death, serious injury, sexual assault, and 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 includes conduct that has occurred on-duty or off-duty.

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.

In drafting the public summary report, I must also consider whether any privacy interests exist. Furthermore, I am mindful of the sensitivities and challenges related to alleged incidents of family violence, which have been considered when summarizing the evidence in this report. The Affected Parties, one of whom is a minor, the Subject Officer, and their family members have a privacy interest in the evidence gathered as part of this investigation. Their privacy interests outweigh the public interest in having the entirety of the evidence published. As such, I have omitted certain details and information from the report.

Mandate invoked: This investigation was authorized under Section 26I of *Police Act* in the public interest.

Timeline: SiRT commenced its investigation on November 30, 2025. The investigation concluded on July 24, 2026. There was delay in completion of the investigation due to the lack of cooperation of Affected Party #1, and receipt of file materials from the Department of Opportunities and Social Development.

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, was seriously injured, or was the victim 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. Police Reports
2. Witness Officer Notes & Reports
3. Body Worn Camera Footage of Initial Complaint/AP #1 Interview
4. Department of Opportunities and Social Development File Materials

INVESTIGATION SUMMARY

On November 30, 2025, Affected Party #1 (AP1) called the RCMP non-emergency police line to report a verbal altercation with her partner, the Subject Officer (SO). A Witness Officer (WO) attended the call, and his conversation with AP1 was captured on body-worn camera (BWC).

AP1’s statement to the WO outlined issues in her relationship with the SO and focused primarily on custody and financial arrangements. AP1 stated that the SO had assaulted their son (Affected Party #2/ AP2) in October 2025, which resulted in a chipped tooth. The WO engaged in safety planning with AP1 and made the appropriate referrals for services at that time. SiRT spoke to AP1 on the phone on November 30, 2025, to discuss the situation. She stated that the SO chipped their autistic son’s tooth on October 10, 2025.

AP1 was not cooperative with the SiRT investigation. The SiRT investigator ultimately arranged for access to files from Child and Family Services, Department of Opportunities and Social Development (OSD). OSD interviewed AP1, AP2, the SO, other family members, and school officials due to the allegations in this matter and other non-SiRT related concerns. Information obtained during those interviews indicated that the chipped tooth was accidental. In a statement with OSD, AP1 stated that the tooth incident was an accident. In the OSD notes, the social worker noted that AP1stated: “When that incident happened I knew it wasn't something that was intentional. I knew he wouldn't hurt his kids.” AP2’s comments to OSD were also consistent with the injury being accidental. The SO told OSD that AP1 had told him she was going to file a complaint to police to use the chipped tooth against him.

The SO is under no obligation to provide a statement to SiRT. In this case, after being advised of the investigation, the SO declined to provide a formal statement. However, he did provide details of the alleged incident and explained the situation, how it was an accident, and that he arranged for dental care for AP2 immediately.

LEGAL ISSUES & ANALYSIS

I must now assess the evidence to determine whether there are reasonable and probable grounds to believe a criminal offence 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. It also requires that the grounds be justifiable from an objective point of view. In other words, a reasonable person must be able to find that grounds exist. In determining whether there are reasonable and probable grounds to lay a charge, all the evidence gathered must be considered.

The incident under investigation occurred in a family home, in a time of distress and conflict. AP1 did not cooperate with the SiRT investigation. Although she initially told police that the SO had assaulted AP2 and caused a broken tooth, she subsequently stated that it was an accident. This is consistent with the statements of other parties.

Credibility and reliability are central to the investigation. In determining an individual's credibility, one must examine all internal and external corroborating and refuting evidence. In assessing the statements given by AP1 to police and OSD, she does not appear to be credible or reliable. She was not cooperative with the investigation. The evidence does not support a finding that the SO committed an assault.

CONCLUSION

I have determined that there are no reasonable grounds to believe the SO committed a criminal offence.