VICTORIA & ESQUIMALT POLICE BOARD

Service or Policy Complaint Agenda

November 17, 2026 – After Public Meeting
Boardroom

1. AGENDA

Pg. 1 a. Adoption of the Service or Policy Agenda of November 17, 2026

2. MINUTES

Pg. 2 a. Approval of the Service or Policy Minutes of May 12, 2026

3. SERVICE OR POLICY COMPLAINT(S)

a. OPCC File No. 2025-000774

Pg. 3
- 2026.03.31 VEPB Concluding Letter to Complainant

Pg. 5
- 2026.06.09 OPCC Concluding Letter
    - *Accordingly, this File is now closed*

b. OPCC File No. 2025-001329

Pg. 6
- 2026.08.17 VEPB Concluding Letter and PSS Recommendation Report
- MOTION: *The Governance Committee recommend the Board conclude its review of the Complaint based on the information outlined in the report; the report was submitted to the Complainant and the Office of the Police Complaint Commissioner August 17, 2026*

Pg. 20
- 2026.10.27 OPCC Concluding Letter
    - *Accordingly, this File is now closed*

VICTORIA & ESQUIMALT POLICE BOARD
Service or Policy Complaints Meeting Minutes
May 12, 2026
Immediately Following the Public Meeting
Boardroom & Zoom

PRESENT

M. Hayes, Chair
M. Alto
A. Boardman – v
H. Courtright
E. Cull
T. Kituri
S. Law
P. Thorkelsson
CC F. Wilson
DC M. Brown
DC J. McRae
Insp. J. Ames
Insp. B. Gubbins
Insp. C. King
Insp. J. Lawson
Insp. J. Malinosky
K. Kosich
T. Parton
Do. Phillips

Regrets: P. Faoro, N. Sukhdeo, Da. Phillips
Recorder: D Robertson

1. AGEDNA

a) Call to Order **5:31 pm**
b) Adoption of the Service or Policy Complaints Agenda of May 12, 2026

26-42 MOTION: *To adopt the Service or Policy Complaints Agenda of May 12, 2026 as presented.*
MOVED/SECONDED/CARRIED

2. MINUTES

a) Approval of the Service or Policy Complaints Minutes of April 21, 2026

26-43 MOTION: *To approve the Service or Policy Complaints Minutes of April 21, 2026 as presented.*
MOVED/SECONDED/CARRIED

3. COMPLAINT

a) For information: Complaint 24-25449
The letter dated April 23rd 2026 and all information re complaint 24-25449 was sent via email to and confirmed received by the Office of the Police Complaint Commissioner.

Meeting adjourned at 5:35 pm

This record and the information contained herein is the property of the Victoria and Esquimalt Police Board. It is not to be reproduced, copied or further disseminated without the express prior consent of the Victoria and Esquimalt Police Board.

VICTORIA & ESQUIMALT POLICE BOARD

March 31, 2026

To: [redacted]

And To: Mr. Prabhu Rajan
Police Complaint Commissioner
Office of the Police Complaint Commissioner

And To: Mr. Glen Lewis
Assistant Deputy Minister & Director
Police Services Division

Via Email

Dear [redacted]

RE: Service or Policy Complaint – VicPD (OPCC File No. 2025-000774)

On May 8, 2025, the Office of the Police Complaint Commissioner ("OPCC") received your Service or Policy complaint outlining your concerns about excessive vehicle noise near your home. You expressed concern about excessive vehicle noise emanating from the main traffic corridors along Blanshard Street, Douglas Street, and Quadra Street, writing, that the *"noise pollution from excessively loud vehicles… has been negatively affecting my enjoyment of the outdoor spaces in my neighbourhood, and even my own backyard."*

You noted provisions under the *Motor Vehicle Act Regulation* dealing with excessive noise from vehicles and requested that the Victoria and Saanich Police Departments enforce these provisions. You also asked for the number of excessive noise tickets issued by VicPD and SPD in 2024.

The Victoria and Esquimalt Police Board (the Board) received a copy of your complaint and tasked Inspector Colin Brown (Insp. Brown) to initiate an investigation under section 171(c) of the *Police Act*.

Inspector Brown consulted with VicPD's traffic section supervisor, Sergeant Brendon Leblanc (Sgt. Leblanc) to assess the feasibility of enforcement under the sections of law you provided. Sgt. Leblanc explained that he rarely receives complaints from citizens about excessive vehicle noise, that it is a difficult ticket to enforce, and that the most effective enforcement is done by issuing speeding tickets (noisy vehicles are often speeding). Even with Sgt. LeBlanc's extensive traffic experience with VicPD and with the Integrated Road Safety Unit, he had never known an excessive noise ticket to be issued.

The assessment by Sgt. Leblanc was consistent with a study completed by Insp. Brown in 2019, when investigating a similar complaint. Insp. Brown's conclusion at that time was that without a change to the *Motor Vehicle Act Regulation (MVAR*), enforcement of excessive noise against vehicles was difficult. The courts identified issues such as instrument calibration and unrelated sound reverberation as being barriers to enforcement.

On June 24, 2025, in your telephone conversation with Insp. Brown, he shared the results of this study and offered to share a redacted copy of his 2019 memo with you. Insp. Brown offered Sgt. Leblanc's perspective that enforcement of the excessive noise section of the *MVAR* was problematic, that VicPD issued no excessive noise tickets in 2024, and that the
Traffic Section dealt with excessive noise through speed enforcement.

You indicated to Insp. Brown that you appreciated his response, and that you would be following up with the City of Victoria and asking them to enact a bylaw which VicPD officers could then enforce. Insp. Brown shared his belief that a city bylaw would not likely solve the current enforcement difficulties identified by the courts, and that a bylaw would likely not address his complaint. At that time, you appeared to express satisfaction with the telephone conversation and your understanding of the challenges VicPD faces in enforcing the excessive noise ticket.

At the September 16, 2025, meeting of the Board, Insp. Brown provided a report of the steps taken to address your concerns. He advised the Board that policy changes were not recommended as a result of this complaint. The Board was satisfied with the steps taken and moved that the matter be resolved, and that you and the OPCC be advised accordingly.

If you are dissatisfied with the outcome of your Service or Policy complaint you may, within 20 business days of receiving this summary, request the Police Complaint Commissioner to review the matter, pursuant to section 172 (2) of the *Police Act*.

We thank you for your time and effort in bringing this matter forward to the board.

Sincerely,

Micayla Hayes

Micayla Hayes
Chair - Victoria and Esquimalt Police Board

OFFICE OF THE POLICE COMPLAINT COMMISSIONER

Integrity
Independence
Fairness

June 9, 2026

OPCC File No. 2025-000774

Micayla Hayes
Chair, Victoria & Esquimalt Police Board
1 Centennial Square
Victoria BC, V8W 1P6

Dear Micayla Hayes,

Re: Service or Policy Complaint of [redacted]

On March 30, 2026, the Office of the Police Complaint Commissioner received a copy of your concluding letter to [redacted], dated September 16, 2025. Your letter detailed the steps taken with respect to the complaint submitted by [redacted] and provided reasons for your decision.

As well, you advised [redacted] of his right to request a review of the matter by our office if he disagreed with your decision. On April 14, 2026, and May 4, 2026, [redacted] requested that the Police Complaint Commissioner review his complaint, and the Board's review of his complaint.

Having had the opportunity to examine the Board's decision, this office is satisfied that the Board's response to the matter is reasonable and will not be making any recommendations for further investigation, study, courses of action or changes to service or policy. Accordingly, our file will now be closed.

I do wish to note that it would have been helpful for the Board to have confirmed whether the suggestions put forward by the Traffic Section related to traffic enforcement and dialogue with residents in the complainant's neighbourhood were implemented.

Alysha Girn
Investigative Analyst

cc: [redacted]
Chief Constable Fiona Wilson, Victoria Police Department

VICTORIA & ESQUIMALT POLICE BOARD

August 17 2026

Sent via email to: [redacted]
[redacted]

RE: Service or Policy Complaint / OPCC File No. 2025-001329

Dear [redacted]

In your complaint of August 23 2025 to the OPCC you raised your concern that a lack of police enforcement of legislation, meant to enhance accessibility for blind Canadians, was contributing to harmful abuses such as denial of service in buses, taxis, rideshare service, and restaurants.

On August 29, 2025, the OPCC forwarded your complaint to the Victoria and Esquimalt Police Board. The Board determined that your complaint should be reviewed. Inspector Colin Brown (retired) took steps to examine the complaint but retired prior to being able to complete his review. Inspector Jennifer Ames has now completed the final steps of this investigation and policy review.

Attached for your review is the completed report filed by Inspector Ames. The review found the policy in place to be adequate in supporting an officer's ability and duty to investigate complaints of service access denial to a blind person. It appeared there could be a lack of awareness of the Guide Dog and Service Dog Act and the enforcement actions possible. This has been addressed with both internal and external educational initiatives directed at VicPD officers, our agency and service partners, and the general public.

The report outlines and reports on the following activities in this investigation:

- Review – Relevant Policy and Legislation
    - Guide Dog and Service Dog Act
    - Victoria Police Department Policy
- Review – Complaint Received
- Review – Police files
- Actions Taken
    - Internal Education
    - Public Education
- Follow-up
- Conclusion

In a call with Inspector Ames on July 3, 2026 you expressed your satisfaction and appreciation with the actions taken by Inspector Ames and Victoria Police in this review.

850 CALEDONIA AVE VICTORIA, BC V8T 5J8 250.995.7217 www.vicpd.ca

After careful consideration of the complaint and the information that was before it, the Board is satisfied with the review and actions taken regarding this complaint, and in concluding this complaint will take no further action. This file is now closed. Thank you for taking the time to share your concerns with the Board.

In the event that you are dissatisfied with the Board's decision, please note that you have 20 business days from receipt of this letter to request a review by contacting the Office of the Police Complaint Commissioner at:

Office of the Police Complaint Commissioner
#501 – 947 Fort Street,
PO Box 9895, Stn Prov Govt
Victoria, BC V8W 9T8

Respectfully,



Micayla Hayes
Chair, Victoria and Esquimalt Police Board

CC:
Chief Constable Fiona Wilson
Inspector Jennifer Ames
Paul Faoro – VEPB Governance Chair
Alysha Girn – Investigative Analyst, OPCC
Office of the Director of Policing and Law Enforcement Services

VICTORIA POLICE DEPARTMENT
Memorandum

TO: The Victoria and Esquimalt Police Board, Governance Committee

FROM: Inspector Jennifer Ames, Executive Services Division

DATE: July 3, 2026

SUBJECT: Service or Policy Complaint – OPCC File No. 2025-001329

Recommendation:

That the Governance Committee of the Victoria and Esquimalt Police Board (the Board) conclude its review of the complaint based on the information outlined in this report and submit its findings to the Office of the Police Complaint Commissioner.

Summary:

1. On August 3, 2025, [redacted] submitted a Service or Policy complaint to the Office of the Police Complaint Commissioner (OPCC). [redacted] is an executive member of the Canadian Federation of the Blind (CFB) and an advocate for public access rights for blind Canadians. [redacted] raised his concern that a lack of police enforcement of legislation, meant to enhance accessibility for blind Canadians, was contributing to harmful abuses such as denial of service in buses, taxis, rideshare service, and restaurants.

2. On August 29, 2025, the OPCC forwarded [redacted] Service or Policy complaint to the Victoria and Esquimalt Police Board (the Board). The Board determined that [redacted] Service or Policy Complaint should be reviewed. They assigned Victoria Police Department

(VicPD) Inspector Colin Brown (retired) (Insp. Brown) to determine if there were inadequacies within VicPD's policies or practices that should be addressed with respect to [redacted] complaint. Inspector Brown took steps to examine [redacted] complaint but retired prior to being able to complete his review. I, Inspector Jennifer Ames, have completed the final steps of this investigation and policy review.

3. Overall, I found the policy in place to be adequate in supporting an officer's ability and duty to investigate complaints of service access denial to a blind person. It appeared there could be a lack of awareness of the *Guide Dog and Service Dog Act* and the enforcement actions possible. This has been addressed with both internal and external educational initiatives directed at VicPD officers, our agency and service partners, and the general public.

4. I recommend that the Board conclude its review based on the information outlined in this report.

Relevant Policy and Legislation:

5. The following were considered relevant to the review of [redacted] Service or Policy Complaint:
    a. The *Guide Dog and Service Dog Act*
    b. VicPD Policy OD020 - General Investigations
    c. VicPD Policy OD015 – Traffic Responsibilities
    d. VicPD Policy AC230 – Fair and Impartial Policing

Complaint Received:

6. In his complaint to the OPCC, [redacted] reported that blind Canadians were subjected to access denials by countless service providers including taxis, buses, and restaurants. The denial of service is often directly related to their accompaniment of a guide dog partner. Blind community members have experienced ride share drivers or taxi drivers driving away or refusing service, and bus drivers refusing access, upon seeing a blind person accompanied by

their guide dog partner. This service denial has resulted in missed medical appointments and blind people being left in dangerous circumstances.

7. [redacted] believes that a lack of enforcement of the *Guide Dog and Service Dog Act* has contributed to service delays, service denials and access refusal to blind community members trying to use public services. He reports that this practice of service denial is endemic throughout the industry; creating misery and anxiety around blind people's use of needed services. [redacted] has called for effective enforcement through the application of fines in support of the rights of blind Canadians.

8. [redacted] included a communication dated January 1, 2021, written by Deputy Chief Michael Brown (retired) (DC Brown) who was the Inspector of the Community Services & Traffic Section at the time. This communication followed a meeting facilitated by DC Brown with greater Victoria Taxi companies and members of the CFB. It laid out legal obligations of taxi companies vis-à-vis guide dogs and service dogs. [redacted] noted his appreciation for DC Brown's efforts which resulted in a step forward, but that more work was needed.

9. [redacted] acknowledged that the problem, in part, is that many blind people are not aware of the fine associated to refusal of service under *Guide Dog and Service Dog Act* and incidents therefore do not get reported to police.

Review of the police files:

10. To gain some perspective on the scope of the problem, a key word search was conducted to review all reported incidents of service access denial to people with service or guide dogs. Keyword searches using the terms, "service dog," "service dogs," and guide dog," with no date restrictions, resulted in the identification of 14 files between 2002 and June of 2026. Of the 14 files:
    a. three were directly related to service access denial of a blind person with a guide dog partner:

i. In 2019 a man was refused service at a restaurant when he would not show credentials for his guide dog. This was resolved with police attendance. No ticket issued.

ii. In 2016, a man was refused service by a local cab company due to his guide dog. This was forwarded to Traffic Section for follow-up. The officer who followed up was advised by a Ministry of Public Safety representative that the *Guide Dog and Service Dog Act* was not enforceable by police but an adjudicator had been assigned to investigate.

iii. In 2002, a man was refused service by a local taxi company. The investigating officer forwarded a report to Crown seeking charge approval. No charges were approved.

b. five were related to service access denial of people with service dogs which were not guide dog partners;

c. four were related to people who claimed to have service dogs but had no credentials to prove their dogs were trained and certified service dogs. The officers in these matters had grounds to believe the dogs were being misrepresented as certified service dogs.

d. In one situation, access to a public venue was denied to a man due to his intoxication and poor behavior, not due the presence of his guide dog partner.

11. Overall, the above reported incidents do not reflect a chronic service denial. However, it is not my intention to suggest the above numbers accurately reflect the real scope of the problem. The lived experiences of blind Canadians say otherwise. It is important to consider the challenges of reporting faced by a blind customer, including an inability to gather identifying details of the offender, and lack of awareness that there is a legislated remedy to this discrimination. [redacted] acknowledges there is work to be done in the blind community to encourage self-advocacy and reporting.

Policy Review:

12. A key issue raised by [redacted] was a failure by VicPD to appropriately enforce the *Guide Dog and Service Dog Act.* To determine if there were inadequacies within VicPD's policies or

practices that should be addressed with respect to [redacted] complaint I have completed a review of the applicable policy. First, it may be useful to be aware of the relevant sections of the *Guide Dog and Service Dog Act.*

Guide Dog and Service Dog Act

13. Police officers may use Section 2 of the *Guide Dog and Service Dog Act* to issue a violation ticket for non-compliance. Section 2 states the following with respect to access to public places:

> (1) A guide dog team, service dog team or dog-in-training team may, in the same manner as would an individual who is not a member of any of those teams, enter and use any place, accommodation, building or conveyance to which the public is invited or has access, provided that the individual who is a member of the team ensures the dog that is a member of the team
>
> > (a) does not occupy a seat in a public conveyance or a place where food is served or dispensed to the public, as the case may be, and
> > (b) is held by a leash or harness.
>
> (2)A person must not
>
> > (a) interfere with the exercise of the right of entry and use specified in subsection (1), or
> > (b) charge a fee, in respect of the exercise of the right of entry and use specified in subsection (1), for the dog that is a member of a guide dog team, service dog team or dog-in-training team.

VicPD Policy

14. While it is not possible to develop a specific policy for every possible investigation or situation encountered by VicPD officers, it is necessary to ensure that, in the absence of a new policy, the

procedures outlined in current policies are sufficient to provide officers appropriate guidance and tools. Ultimately, policy should be reflective of the law and current standards.

15. I considered the appropriateness and efficacy of current VicPD policies and whether a policy update, or a new policy was necessary to ensure appropriate action can be taken when infractions of the *Guide Dog and Service Act* are reported. Specifically, I reviewed policies OD015 – Traffic Responsibilities, OD020 – General Investigations, and AC230 – Fair and Impartial Policing.

AC230- Fair and Impartial Policing

16. VicPD policy AC230 – Fair and Impartial Policing states:

> 4.2 All calls for service will be given full consideration, and the personal circumstances of the involved parties in an incident will not diminish the police response.
>
> 4.3 To those identified as vulnerable persons due to factors that may increase their vulnerability, members will provide additional reasonable assistance beyond what is generally provided and alter investigative procedures if necessary to ensure effective police intervention in protecting persons from violence or abuse.
>
> 4.3.1
> Members should make efforts to ascertain the needs of vulnerable persons by communicating with that person or their guardian, and where communication is difficult assistance should be obtained.

17. The purpose of policy AC230 is to ensure service is delivered in a fair and equitable manner. It requires that members take into consideration factors which contribute to vulnerabilities of community members, and to provide reasonable assistance, while taking those vulnerabilities into account. This would apply to an officer investigating a report being made by a blind

complainant and requires that they accommodate the complainant's special needs to ensure a fulsome report can be made.

OD015 – Traffic Responsibilities

18. Policy OD015 – Traffic Responsibilities states:

1.1 The Victoria Police Department will staff a Traffic Unit to:

1.1.1 Liaise with partners in relation to traffic safety and enforcement;

1.1.2 Respond to and investigate traffic incidents;

1.1.3 Conduct traffic enforcement and education;

1.1.5 Provide specialized support in traffic-related investigations.

19. Policy OD015 lays out the role of Traffic Section officers which includes working with community partners for safety and enforcement, conducting education, and providing specialized support. Sergeant Brendon Leblanc, of VicPD's Traffic Section, has taken an active role in preparing educational bulletins and providing solutions to address [redacted] concerns.

OD020 – General Investigations

20. In exploring VicPD policy OD020 – General Investigations I noted that section 1 sets out that "investigations will be conducted and documented in a consistent, objective, accountable, transparent, fair, and impartial manner."

21. Section three of the policy OD020 – General Investigations outlines the following general procedures for investigation:

3.1 Victoria Police Department members and staff will receive any request for service whether received in person, over the police radio, over the phone, or online.

3.2 For any requests received online, over the phone, or in person, the member or staff will determine the most appropriate avenue for the request to be investigated and forward the request to the appropriate section if applicable, or conclude the request as not a police matter.

3.3 Patrol members will primarily conduct the preliminary investigation; however, in some circumstances, a request to transfer the investigation to another section may occur.

3.4 Patrol members will report any incidents requiring specialist follow-up to their supervisor who may call-out specialty resources or initiate a referral to the appropriate section.

22. The purpose of policy OD20 is to ensure legal requirements of investigations are met and to provide for appropriate streaming of investigations as necessary.

Policy Conclusion

23. The provisions in the above policies provide appropriate guidance and direction for officers who may find themselves investigating complaints in relation to the *Guide Dog and Service Dog Act.* The policy emphasizes the importance of ensuring equitable service to all people, provides direction in appropriate streaming of calls, and allows for investigations to be delegated to units with specialized knowledge such as the Traffic Section. It appears that the policy is reflective of current standards.

Actions Taken:

24. In addition to a policy review, Inspector Brown understood the importance of addressing [redacted] concerns in a concrete and meaningful way. To do so, he sought assistance from Sergeant Brendon Leblanc (Sgt. Leblanc), the supervisor of the VicPD Traffic Section. Sgt. Leblanc possesses extensive Professional Standards and Traffic knowledge. Sgt. Leblanc suggested three possible steps forward which included:

a. A 3-day Traffic campaign focused on enforcement of the *Guide Dog and Service Dog Act* To do so would require catching offenders in the act of violating the law. This would involve using members of the CFB and their guide dog partners;
b. An education campaign by the VicPD Traffic Section educating all VicPD officers on the laws and enforcement of the *Guide Dog and Service Dog Act*; and
c. VicPD conduct a media campaign providing education to the public of the law.

Traffic Campaign:

25. The traffic enforcement campaign proposed by Sgt. Leblanc was explored but ultimately not practical due to the safety and legal challenges around treating a civilian as an agent for the purposes of traffic enforcement. Sgt. Leblanc explained to [redacted] why a traffic "sting" operation would be impractical.

Internal Education:

26. As awareness of the *Guide Dog and Service Dog Act* may have been limited, Sgt. Leblanc led the educational campaign which included the information below being disseminated to VicPD Watch Commanders, EComm, and to the Integrated Road Safety Unit:

> "Where possible, VicPD Traffic will always strive to investigate complaints from the Blind community, but in instances where there is a safety concern, or no traffic units available, it may fall upon a patrol member to issue a VT. VicPD Traffic is working towards reducing an ongoing problem experienced by members of Canadian Federation of the Blind, and the local Blind Community in Victoria / Esquimalt regarding taxi / ride share service. Many Blind people within our communities have reported some of the following scenarios surrounding transporting themselves and their service animals via:
>
> i. Taxi dispatch refusing to dispatch a taxi when they learn about a service dog;

ii. Taxi / ride share drivers refusing to give a ride to the service dog and their handler;
iii. Taxi / ride share drivers demanding an extra fee to transport a service dog, or a cleaning fee;
iv. Taxi / ride share drivers demanding proof of the service dog credentials; and
v. Taxi / ride share drivers demanding to know the disability of the person involved.

In short, all the above are offences enforceable under the *Guide Dog and Service Dog Act* on a regular *Offence Act* Violation Ticket. Members of the Blind community have reported that in many jurisdictions, the police dispatchers or police officers have very limited knowledge of the laws which results in the matter not being dispatched and cited as civil only. Below are the basic offences and associated fine amounts for the above situations:

		Fine	**Victim Surcharge**	**Ticketed Amount**
b.	Section 2(2) (a) Interference with right of entry and use	$250	$38	$288
c.	Section 2(2)(b) Illegal fee for Dog	$250	$38	$288"

27. Sgt. Leblanc communicated to EComm leadership with education and also with the direction that, for non-emergency events related to the above enforcement, the matter be dispatched to VicPD Traffic units for response. Where possible, the Traffic Unit would be the first resource to investigate complaints of this type. He advised VicPD Watch Commanders that, wherever possible, VicPD Traffic Section would take the lead on complaints involving enforcement of the *Guide Dog and Service Dog Act.*

28. [redacted] noted that blind Canadians were often unaware of the fine that could be applied against infractions of the *Guide Dog and Service Dog Act.* Sgt. Leblanc worked with [redacted] to send messaging through the CFB with regard to the types of incidents that can be enforced and what type of information will be most useful to police in taking potential enforcement action.

Public Education:

29. In June of 2026, after weeks of planning, development, and filming in collaboration with [redacted] and other members of the CFB, VicPD's Community Engagement Division released a series of three public education reels. In the first, [redacted] and [redacted] representing the CFB, introduced the issue. The second two videos presented simulated accessibility challenges commonly encountered. These reels highlighted the accessibility challenges faced by blind members of our community, the laws supporting accessibility under the *Guide Dog and Service Dog Act*, and education on the potential fines for non-compliance with the law.

Follow-up:

30. On July 3, 2026, I had the opportunity to speak with [redacted] on the phone. I updated [redacted] with the findings of my review and summarized the action taken by VicPD in response to his Service or Policy complaint. This included:
    a. the educational bulletins prepared by Sgt. Leblanc;
    b. the ownership of Traffic Unit members for reports of *Guide Dog and Service Dog Act* infractions;
    c. the policy review; and
    d. the Community Engagement Division public education campaign.

31. [redacted] expressed his satisfaction, and appreciation with the actions taken and stated his hope that there would be a long-term positive effect. I thanked [redacted] for raising the matter for review and for his ongoing advocacy for blind Canadians.

Conclusion:

The Victoria Police Department acknowledges [redacted] concerns and the challenges and indignities faced by blind Canadians in relation to service access denials. From a review of the

applicable policies, it appears there is sufficient guidance in existing policy for members required to follow up on complaints related to infractions of the *Guide Dog and Service Dog Act*. The VicPD Traffic Section, Community Engagement Division, and Professional Standards have worked in collaboration with [redacted] and other representatives of the CFB, to fill gaps in education through internal and external communications. As a result, I do not believe that any policy changes are required at this time. I recommend that the Governance Committee of the Victoria and Esquimalt Police Board (the Board) conclude its review of the complaint based on the information outlined in this report and submit its findings to the Office of the Police Complaint Commissioner.

Sincerely,



Inspector Jennifer Ames
Victoria Police Department

Office of the
Police Complaint Commissioner

British Columbia, Canada

October 27, 2026 OPCC File No. 2025-001329

Micayla Hayes
Chair, Victoria & Esquimalt Police Board
1 Centennial Square
Victoria, BC V8W 1P6

Dear Chair Hayes,

Re: Service or Policy Complaint of [redacted]

On August 18, 2026, the Office of the Police Complaint Commissioner received a copy of your concluding letter to [redacted], dated August 17, 2026. Your letter carefully detailed the steps taken with respect to the complaint submitted by [redacted] and provided reasons for your decision.

As well, you advised [redacted] of their right to request a review of the matter by our office if they disagreed with your decision. To date, our office has not received such a request from [redacted].

Having had the opportunity to examine the Board's decision, this office is satisfied with the outcome and will not be making any recommendations for further investigation, study, courses of action, or changes to service or policy respecting this matter. Accordingly, our file will now be closed.

I would also like to commend the Board and the Department for their response to this complaint. It is evident that the complainant's concerns were taken seriously by both the Board and the Department and addressed through meaningful dialogue and collaboration. The response demonstrates a constructive approach to addressing concerns raised through the service and policy complaint process and, in this case, will contribute to improved services to visually impaired people in the Department's service area and potentially beyond.

Prabhu Rajan
Police Complaint Commissioner

Prabhu Rajan
Police Complaint Commissioner

2nd Floor, 947 Fort Street
PO Box 9895 Stn Prov Govt
Victoria, British Columbia V8W 9T8
Tel: (250) 356-7458 Fax: (250) 356-6503

Toll Free 1 877-999-8707 ⌖ Website: www.opcc.bc.ca

cc: [redacted]
Chief Constable Fiona Wilson, Victoria Police Department
Inspector Jennifer Ames, Professional Standards Section, Victoria Police Department