



BOARD REPORT

To: Chair and Members
Brantford Police Services Board

From: Inspector Kevin Reeder

Date: May 5, 2026

Subject: Report on Section 81(1) Investigation (SIU)
(SIU# 25-OCI-525)

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 Sunday December 21, 2025 at 3:16AM Brantford Police Officers attended a residence in the area of Murray Street after receiving a call that a domestic dispute was in progress. The caller reported hearing banging, screaming and items being thrown around the residence by a male and female. Police were familiar with the occupants, including the subject male, who were known historically to be uncooperative with police.

Officers contained the residence and heard arguing and screaming from within. A knock at the door was conducted at which time the subject male was observed by containment officer exiting a window onto the roof. The subject ran towards a staircase and then jumped off the staircase onto the ground. Containment officers observed this and were able to arrest him quickly and without incident. It was subsequently learned that the subject male had broken his ankle when he jumped off the staircase.

The subject male was taken to the hospital for medical treatment and the SIU was contacted. The SIU investigated the circumstances and the actions by police, naming two officers as Subject Officials and four officers as Witness Officials.

On his assessment of the evidence, SIU Director Joseph Martino determined:

“There are no questions raised in the evidence regarding the lawfulness of the Complainant’s arrest. The evidence indicates that he was present with the subject in violation of a judicial release order.

There are also no concerns in the evidence regarding inappropriate force or a lack of care by police. The Complainant jumped of his own volition, breaking his ankle in the process, and his arrest thereafter was largely uneventful with no strikes or significant force of any kind being brought to bear.

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

As a result, the investigation was closed with no further action being taken by SIU.

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.