



Summary of Investigation

SiRT File # 2026-0067

Referral from

Bridgewater Police regarding
Annapolis Royal Police Service

May 15, 2026

Erin E. Nauss
Director
October 21, 2026

SiRT MANDATE

The Serious Incident Response Team (SiRT) is responsible for investigating incidents involving death, serious injury, sexual assault, intimate partner violence, and other matters that are determined to be in the public interest. These incidents may arise from the actions of any police officer in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick.

SiRT investigates incidents that occur both on and off duty. This independent oversight helps ensure public confidence in the process and avoids any real or perceived bias that could result from police officers investigating other police officers.

At the conclusion of each investigation, the SiRT Director must decide whether the evidence supports laying criminal charges against the officer involved. If the Director determines that charges are not warranted, a public summary of the investigation is released. This summary explains the reasons for the decision and includes the information required by regulation. Public summaries are prepared to provide sufficient information for the public to understand the Director's findings, reasoning, and conclusions.

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

Timeline: SiRT commenced its investigation on May 15, 2026. The investigation concluded on September 17, 2026.

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. Police Reports | 4. Civilian Witness Notes & Statements (2) |
| 2. Subject Officer Statement (1) | |
| 3. Witness Officer Statements, Notes & Reports (3) | 5. Police Complaint Forms |
| | 6. Photographs |

INVESTIGATION SUMMARY

Incident Overview

On May 15, 2026, SiRT received a referral from the Chief of Bridgewater Police Service, who was contacted by a member of the Annapolis Royal Police Service (ARPS) and a member of the Annapolis Royal Board of Police Commissioners. The Board member indicated that a Police Occurrence Report had been generated that alleged:

- two members of the ARPS had conspired to commit murder; and
- a member of the ARPS had extorted another ARPS member.

Given the seriousness of the allegations, SiRT assumed jurisdiction over the investigation in the public interest. In combination with available information and the fact that the alleged conspiracy had occurred more than a year earlier, SiRT determined that there was no immediate risk to public safety.

The allegations were that two ARPS members, Subject Officers #1 and #2 (SO1 and SO2), discussed harming a well-known offender in the area (the Affected Party/AP). The evidence indicates that, in May 2025, SO2 attended SO1's home to continue an earlier discussion about harming the AP, although it is unclear who arranged the meeting. SO2 suggested leaving their phones in another room and stated that an associate could take care of the AP. SO2 allegedly asked SO1 for the AP's address, and SO1 responded that he wanted to be present. The precise details of the discussion remain uncertain, and no independent witnesses are available to verify either account.

SO2 stated that SO1 arranged the meeting and that he never intended to act on the discussion. However, other ARPS officers reported that SO1 told them SO2 had arranged the meeting and that SO1 participated only to gather evidence that SO2 was a corrupt officer.

It is alleged that, in May 2026, SO2 extorted SO1 by threatening to release a recording of their earlier conversation if SO1 did not do as he requested regarding a work matter.

SO1 reported these interactions to Witness Officer #1 (WO1), who prepared a Police Occurrence Report addressing both allegations.

Civilian Witnesses

SiRT interviewed a civilian employee of the Town of Annapolis Royal and a member of its Board of Police Commissioners. Both provided helpful background and context but had no direct evidence concerning the alleged offences.

Civilian Witness #1 (CW1) learned of the allegations from another ARPS officer. She interacted with SO1 when he went on leave in May 2026 and expressed concern for his well-being. She also noted that, at the relevant time in May 2025, SO1 was hospitalized and heavily sedated with medication.

Witness Officers

SiRT interviewed three witness officers with material information about the alleged events. Each independently reported direct conversations with SO1 concerning the allegations but had no firsthand knowledge of the events.

Witness Officer #1 (WO1) reported that SO1 told him SO2 had requested a meeting to discuss harming the AP. SO1 said he provided no information to SO2 and participated only to gather evidence that SO2 was a corrupt police officer. SO1 also told WO1 that SO2 threatened to release a recording of their discussion about harming the AP if he did not do as he requested about a work matter. WO1 later saw SO1's work belongings on his office desk and photographed them because he believed SO1 had left ARPS.

WO1 prepared a Police Occurrence Report alleging that SO1 and SO2 were involved in conspiracy to commit murder and extortion.

Witness Officer #2 (WO2) also reported that SO1 told him SO2 had requested a meeting to discuss harming the AP.

On May 23, 2026, WO2 found two unsigned documents on his computer network folder that he had not authored and were added without his knowledge. Written from SO1's perspective, the documents stated that SO2 attended a meeting at SO1's home on May 3 or 10, 2025, to discuss eliminating an individual. They further alleged that SO2 threatened SO1 that he would release a recording unless he complied with a request about a work matter. The documents also referred to SO1 requesting an investigation into SO2 and anticipating that SO2 would file a conspiracy complaint. WO2 provided the documents to SiRT as part of the investigation.

Witness Officer #3 (WO3) provided a similar account, reporting that SO1 told him SO2 had requested a meeting to discuss harming the AP.

All three officers stated that SO1 told them he was taking medication due to a health issue and not thinking clearly at the time of the alleged meeting with SO2, and that he had neither made notes nor created a police occurrence about it.

Subject Officers (SOs)

Subject officers are not required by law to submit to an interview or provide their notes and reports to SiRT. SO1 decided not to provide any notes, reports, or attend an interview with SiRT.

SiRT interviewed SO2 on July 9 and August 6, 2026, scheduling the interview over two dates to accommodate his availability. SO2 expressed concerns about what he viewed as inadequate accountability and deficiencies in ARPS policies. He also described disagreements between SO1 and other officers.

SO2's account of the May 2025 meeting attributed the discussion about harming the AP to SO1. SO2 stated that SO1 invited him to his residence, where SO2 attended in police uniform on either May 17 or 24, 2025. According to SO2, SO1 referred to using "black ops" or "old school justice" and said he wanted the AP "dealt with." SO2 said he continued the conversation to assess SO1's intentions. SO2 acknowledged asking that their cell phones be put away, asking whether SO1 wanted the AP warned, roughed up, or to suffer broken bones, and requesting the AP's name and address to be written on a piece of paper. SO2 said SO1 left the decision about what should happen to the AP to him. It does not appear that anything was written on paper.

SO2 denied ever intending to harm the AP or commit a criminal offence. He maintained that his participation in the conversation was intended to determine whether SO1 "was serious". SO2

stated that he contacted a colleague and described the meeting and SO1's comments. SO2 stated they laughed about the incident and agreed not to take any further action because they did not consider the discussion serious.

SO2 stated that he contacted SO1 in May 2026 about a work matter. Frustrated by SO1's response, SO2 confronted him on May 13, 2026, and swore at him. According to SO2, SO1 interpreted his remarks as threatening. SO2 said SO1 later asked about the work matter.

Affected Party

SiRT made several efforts to contact the AP, who was the subject of the alleged discussions. However, as of the date this report was released, SiRT was unable to contact him.

Police Complaint

As part of its investigation, SiRT reviewed a complaint submitted to the Nova Scotia Office of the Police Complaints Commissioner by SO2 against SO1 related to this matter.

Other

SiRT made efforts to locate the recording referred to related to the extortion allegation. SiRT was unable to locate the recording and there is no evidence that such a recording exists.

RELEVANT LEGISLATION

Criminal Code:

Conspiracy

465 (1) Except where otherwise expressly provided by law, the following provisions apply in respect of conspiracy:

- (a) every one who conspires with any one to commit murder or to cause another person to be murdered, whether in Canada or not, is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to a maximum term of imprisonment for life;
- (b) every one who conspires with any one to prosecute a person for an alleged offence, knowing that they did not commit that offence, is guilty of

- (i) an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term of not more than 10 years or an offence punishable on summary conviction, if the alleged offence is one for which, on conviction, that person would be liable to be sentenced to imprisonment for life or for a term of not more than 14 years, or
- (ii) an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term of not more than five years or an offence punishable on summary conviction, if the alleged offence is one for which, on conviction, that person would be liable to imprisonment for less than 14 years;
- (c) every one who conspires with any one to commit an indictable offence not provided for in paragraph (a) or (b) is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to the same punishment as that to which an accused who is guilty of that offence would, on conviction, be liable; and
- (d) every one who conspires with any one to commit an offence punishable on summary conviction is guilty of an offence punishable on summary conviction.

Extortion

346 (1) Every one commits extortion who, without reasonable justification or excuse and with intent to obtain anything, by threats, accusations, menaces or violence induces or attempts to induce any person, whether or not he is the person threatened, accused or menaced or to whom violence is shown, to do anything or cause anything to be done.

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.

Conspiracy to commit murder requires proof that two or more people agreed to commit the offence and intended to carry out that agreement. A discussion about committing an offence, without a genuine, shared intention to carry it out, is not sufficient to establish conspiracy. Where only two people are alleged to have conspired and one did not intend to carry out the common plan, the offence of conspiracy is not established (*R. v. O'Brien*, [1954] S.C.R. 666).

In the present case, there is insufficient evidence to establish that SO1 and SO2 reached an agreement to harm the AP with a shared intention to carry out that agreement. The first- and second-hand accounts of SO1 and SO2 differ significantly as to who initiated the discussion. SO2 acknowledged that he participated in the discussion, and that he asked that their cell phones be put away. He also stated he asked whether SO1 wanted the AP warned, roughed up, or to suffer broken bones, and requested the AP's name and address. However, SO2 denied having any intention of harming the AP and stated that he continued the conversation only to determine whether SO1 was serious. SO2 did not take any steps after the conversation and stated he did not consider the discussion to be serious. There is no indication that they developed a plan to harm the AP or took further steps together to carry out a plan.

The discussion alone does not establish a conspiracy. Given SO2's denial of any intention to harm the AP, the conflicting accounts of the purpose and initiation of the meeting, and the absence of evidence of a subsequent joint plan or action, there are insufficient grounds to support a charge of conspiracy to commit murder against SO1 and SO2.

To establish extortion, there must be evidence that without reasonable justification or excuse and with the intent to obtain something, the person in question used threats, accusations, menaces or violence to induce or attempt to induce another person to do something. It is not necessary that the accused obtain what was sought; an attempt to induce the other person is sufficient.

SO2 acknowledged that he became upset and swore at SO1 during a discussion about work scheduling. However, there is insufficient evidence that he made any threat or accusation, used violence, or threatened to release a recording of their May 2025 conversation. SO1 did not provide direct evidence to substantiate the account he gave the witness officers. On this basis there is insufficient evidence for grounds to support a charge of extortion against SO2.

CONCLUSION

After a careful review of the evidence and the law, I have determined that there are no reasonable grounds to believe either of the SOs committed a criminal offence.

The investigation identified concerning conduct and issues involving interpersonal conflict and best practices. These concerns were shared with the Minister of Justice.