



Serious Incident Response Team

Civilian Director's Report
SIRT-NL File No. 2025-0001

Stephen Ring
Director
September 15, 2025

Introduction

On January 8, 2025, the Serious Incident Response Team (SIRT-NL) received a referral from the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) relating to a complaint of criminal harassment against a RCMP member.

Mandate

SIRT-NL is a civilian led oversight agency that conducts its own investigations into serious incidents. Serious incidents within this context are those involving serious injury, death, sexual offence, domestic violence, or any matter of significant public interest arising from the actions of a police officer in Newfoundland and Labrador. Because this matter involved an allegation that a member of the public was being criminally harassed by an RCMP officer, the complaint was a matter of significant public interest, which falls within SIRT-NL mandate. Accordingly, I directed a SIRT-NL investigation into this matter.

The strategy for the investigation was a traditional one; focusing on interviewing the affected person, civilian witnesses, the subject officer and obtaining any corroborating and/or refuting evidence that was available. The complexity of the investigation did not merit initiating major case management.

Terminology

I have made the following substitutions to protect the privacy of those involved:

- “Affected Person” or “AP” for the individual who alleged she was criminally harassed;
- “Subject Officer” or “SO” for the police officer who is the subject of this investigation;
- “Witness Officer #” or “WO#” for any police officer who provided relevant information; and
- “Witness #” or “W#” for any civilian who provided relevant information.

Investigation

The SIRT-NL investigation began on January 9, 2025, and concluded on June 25, 2025.

During the investigation, SIRT-NL took the following steps:

- Collected and reviewed:
 - copies of RCMP PROS investigative files and Operation Communication Center (OCC) recordings
 - phone records, emails, Facebook messages and photographs obtained from AP
 - SO’s phone records

- Facebook messages received from civilian witnesses
- PROS audit, CPIC audit, and Motor Registration Division (MRD) audit
- recording of a peace bond hearing that was filed by AP against SO
- witness officers' police notes

- Obtained audio recorded statements from:
 - AP, W1, W2, W3, W4, WO1, WO2, and WO3

- Obtained a Production Order to acquire AP's phone records

Overview

The Serious Incident Response Team of Newfoundland and Labrador (SIRT-NL) initiated an independent investigation on January 8, 2025, following a referral from the RCMP concerning allegations of criminal harassment made by AP against SO. On May 21, 2025, SO was further designated as a Subject Officer in relation to allegations of harassing communications and perjury.

The investigation spanned from January 9 to June 25, 2025. The offences under review included criminal harassment, harassing communications, and perjury under the **Criminal Code of Canada**.

The Affected Person (AP)

On January 8, 2025, the RCMP interviewed AP. The SIRT-NL investigator also interviewed AP on January 15, April 24, and June 16, 2025. Below is a summary of these interviews:

AP initiated contact with SO in September 2024 via Facebook, leading to a brief romantic relationship. Initially, their interactions were casual and included social outings and communication through various platforms. However, SO's behaviour quickly became intense and intrusive. SO frequently messaged AP, showed up uninvited at public places, and expressed deep emotional attachment, including getting tattoos with her name and initials. AP described feeling overwhelmed and increasingly uncomfortable with SO's persistent contact, especially after she attempted to end the relationship following his impaired driving charge.

Despite AP's requests for space, SO continued to contact her through texts, emails, Facebook, and Snapchat. SO sent emotionally manipulative messages, including apologies, declarations of love, and sexually explicit content. AP reported that SO showed up at her nursing formal uninvited, attempted to find her hotel room, and later gave her unsettling gifts including a sex toy and a handwritten letter expressing his intent to visit her again. AP also discovered that SO had accessed her personal information through police databases, which she had never shared with him, further escalating her fear.

AP blocked SO on all platforms, but he continued to reach out to her friends and even attempted to contact her through anonymous phone calls. AP described feeling unsafe, especially for her children, and feared that SO might show up at her home. AP emphasized that SO only ceased communication after being instructed to do so by SIRT-NL and the RCMP.

AP received numerous calls from unknown numbers in April and May 2025, which she suspected were from SO.

Civilian Witnesses

Witness 1 (W1)

On January 15, 2025, the SIRT-NL investigator interviewed W1. Following is a summary of the interview:

W1, a long-time friend of AP, recalled that AP had been in a relationship with SO for approximately seven weeks and that even after the relationship ended, he continued to contact her despite being blocked on nearly all social media platforms. While W1 didn't see or read any of the messages between AP and SO, she found it particularly odd that SO still managed to send an email to AP after being blocked. W1 saw photos of the two tattoos SO had gotten—one with AP's name and another with her initials. AP told W1 that she was afraid of SO describing him as unpredictable and noting that he had claimed to know where she lived. This raised fears that he might show up at her house.

On New Year's Day, W1 posted a video featuring a photo of herself and AP which she believed prompted the officer to send her a friend request and ask if he could contact her. W1 declined, citing her personal history with impaired driving and her acquaintance with SO's ex-wife, indicating she would not be a suitable person for him to talk to.

Witness 2 (W2)

On January 15, 2025, the SIRT-NL investigator interviewed W2. Following is a summary of the interview:

W2, a friend of AP, recalled reading a letter SO gave to AP after their breakup, which included a statement that he intended to visit her upon returning home. W2 was aware of the Christmas gifts exchanged between the two, which included an iPad, winter accessories, and a sex toy. W2 described the events surrounding the nursing class Winter Formal on November 23–24, 2025, as particularly intense. During that weekend, SO walked to the hotel to deliver flowers to AP and attempted to contact her persistently, including messaging their mutual friend W3. W2 witnessed AP eventually messaging SO telling him to leave her and her friends alone. W2 also saw a Snapchat video of SO walking in the rain with flowers, which he sent to AP. Earlier that day, W2 reviewed messages between the two about their breakup.

W2 noted AP's constant need to be physically close to AP when they were together and described his behavior as strange. W2 confirmed that SO frequently sent texts, calls, Facebook messages, and Snapchats, many of which were shown to her by AP. She also observed SO showing up at the library while they were studying. W2 saw both of the tattoos SO had with AP's name—one in person and the other in a photo.

Witness 3 (W3)

On January 15 and May 5, 2025, the SIRT-NL investigator interviewed W3. Following is a summary of the interview:

W3, a friend of AP, noted that SO came on very strong and persistently contacted AP through calls and messages. W3 recalled an incident where AP posted a photo on Snapchat while at a coffee shop and SO showing up shortly after, acting as if he didn't know they were there. W3 also mentioned that SO would join them at the library while they studied, often just sitting nearby.

After the breakup, W3 received a Facebook friend request and a phone call from SO asking about AP. During the nursing school formal, W3 was at a hotel with AP when SO messaged her trying to find out their room number to deliver flowers. W3 was also present when AP opened the Christmas gifts from the officer, including a letter that was read aloud to her. AP expressed concern for her safety and emphasized that the officer did not respect boundaries and would not take no for an answer.

W3 confirmed that AP received numerous phone calls from an unknown person during April and May 2025.

Witness 4 (W4)

On January 15, 2025, the SIRT-NL investigator interviewed W4. Following is a summary of the interview:

W4, a childhood friend of AP, confirmed that the relationship between AP and SO began in early fall. Although she wasn't present during the nursing formal, she heard that SO persistently contacted AP and her friends during that event. W4 also knew about the two tattoos SO had with AP's name. On December 8, 2024, W4 received a Facebook message from SO asking her to contact AP on his behalf. W4 firmly told him to stop and leave her alone and has not heard from him since. W4 stated that she is unaware of the current status of their relationship.

Witness Officers

Witness Officer 1 (WO1)

On January 13, 2025, the SIRT-NL investigator obtained an audio recorded statement from WO1. Following is a summary of WO1's interview:

WO1, a former supervisor of SO, was contacted by AP on December 30, 2024, after she had reached out to the RCMP OCC. AP disclosed that she had been in a relationship with SO for approximately six weeks and was concerned about his continued contact after their breakup. WO1 was informed by WO2 that AP suspected that SO accessed her information through police systems. WO1 advised AP that the RCMP would need to act on the information she provided and encouraged her to document a timeline to support her complaint. WO1 also noted that AP expressed fear about the officer's return from Ontario and his unpredictable behavior, including knowledge of her address and contact with her friends. WO1 later coordinated with other RCMP staff to ensure that AP could speak with a senior officer and briefed RCMP management staff on the situation. WO1 did not speak directly with SO regarding the complaint.

Witness Officer 2 (WO2)

On January 15, 2025, the SIRT-NL investigator obtained an audio recorded statement from WO2. Following is a summary of WO2's interview:

WO2 confirmed receiving a request from AP to contact her and subsequently informed other RCMP staff. He did not speak directly to SO but shared the complaint with his unit. WO2 noted that AP had blocked SO on social media but continued to receive emails from him, and that AP suspected that SO accessed her information through police systems given that SO claimed to know where she lived despite her never sharing that information.

Witness Officer 3 (WO3)

On January 15, 2025, the SIRT-NL investigator obtained an audio recorded statement from WO3. Following is a summary of WO3's interview:

WO3 conducted an audio-recorded interview of AP. During the interview, AP expressed fear for her safety, especially when SO returned to NL. WO3 recalled a prior incident on November 24, 2024, when he and another RCMP officer conducted a wellness check on SO, who was reportedly home alone and experiencing distress. WO3 confirmed that he had not spoken with SO regarding the complaint.

Subject Officer

The Subject Officer declined to participate in an interview.

Peace Bond Application

AP filed a peace bond application against SO which centered on allegations of criminal harassment. On May 2, 2025, AP testified that her relationship with SO began in September and ended in November 2024. SO continued contacting her through calls, texts, emails, and social media despite her requests to stop. AP described his behavior as obsessive and unsettling, citing

incidents such as him showing up uninvited, contacting her friends, and getting tattoos with her name and initials. AP expressed fear for her and her children's safety, especially upon SO's return from Ontario, and noted that he accessed her personal information through police databases.

Under cross-examination by SO's counsel, AP acknowledged that the emails exchanged were respectful and that she had no proof of contact since early January, though she remained concerned. AP's witnesses corroborated her claims, describing SO's attempts to locate her during a nursing formal and his persistent communication.

SO testified that he struggled emotionally after the breakup and admitted to contacting AP and her friends, but claimed he stopped once informed of the complaint. He also admitted to accessing her information through PROS out of curiosity.

The presiding Provincial Court Judge dismissed the peace bond application, citing insufficient evidence and the lack of threatening behavior from the subject officer. The most troubling aspect of the case was SO's unauthorized access to AP's information.

Issue and Conclusion

On January 8, 2025, SIRT-NL received notification from the RCMP, relating to a complaint of criminal harassment made by AP against SO. On May 21, 2025, SO was further designated as a subject officer in relation to allegations of harassing communications and perjury.

1. Criminal Harassment

I have reviewed the investigative file and have not formed reasonable grounds to believe that SO criminally harassed AP. I base my opinion on the fact that there was considerable mutual contact between the parties. From my review of the investigative file, it appears that up to November 23, 2024, AP was telling SO that she loved him. On November 24, 2024, AP provided notice that she no longer wished to have any contact with SO when she stated in a text: "SO if this is unclear, we're done. Your behaviour is unacceptable and quite frankly ridiculous. My friends last night were genuinely concerned for my well being. And you don't seem to understand your actions. I'm telling you now I don't want to speak to you and I don't want to see you."

After telling SO that she did not want any further contact, AP and SO further communicated and arranged for an exchange of Christmas gifts on November 27, 2025. AP would have met alone with SO at that time. SO texted AP on December 3, 2024, and asked: "Hi AP, could I write you after your final exams, just didn't like how things ended and would like to try to speak with you one day if that's something you're okay with. If not and you don't want to hear from me, let me know and I'll leave you alone. Good luck with exams. Thanks." An e-mail from SO on December 8, 2025, stated: "Hi AP, I guess you've blocked me on everything so I guess that's it. Would like

if you could just tell me that. Was hoping for a chance to chat with you. I guess not...I wish you all the best. Take care.”

AP responded to SO on December 9, 2025, stating: “Hi SO, I don’t want to leave you without any closure, so please take this email as that. I didn’t mean to upset you but I have a lot of things going on in my life right now. You don’t take my need for space very well, you never have. You say you respect boundaries, but you don’t abide by my for them. I felt like the easiest thing for me to do was to set ones you couldn’t break for you. I hope things are getting better for you, and I wish you well. I don’t hold anything against you, but I think at this time in my life, I need to focus on myself and you definitely need to prioritize yourself and your sobriety. I hope you can respect that this is what I want and need. Please leave my friends out of any further communication as well, they don’t want to be involved. I wish you the best.”

Two further e-mails are worthy of mention: On December 10, 2025, SO wrote AP stating: “Thank you for taking the time to write AP and I appreciate the closure. Sorry for disobeying your space. That was my bad. I wish you all the best and I won’t bother your friends in this situation either. I will always hold you in high regard and appreciate who you are as a person. You know how to get a hold of me if you ever want to. I am doing and going to a program to get healthy. I hope your life, your family and children are healthy and happy. I hope you have a great holiday season thank you, Ta tu I mo chroi.” On December 16, 2025, SO wrote AP again stating: “Hey AP, Sorry I’ve been struggling with one last piece of closure. I will be attending a 7 week inpatient program for mental health and addiction starting January 4th. I was wondering if it would be appropriate to contact you after the program for a coffee and see how things are going? Or if you want to move forward without me at all I would understand, just wondering how you feel. Thank you.” There was also a missed call from SO on December 27, 2025.

From the above and SO’s testimony at a Peace Bond Hearing that was filed by AP against SO, it appears that SO would have been struggling with the breakdown of his relationship with AP. It appears that the contact he made post-breakup was respectful in nature and there was no threatening behaviour. I am of the opinion that the mutual nature of most of the contact between AP and SO is important in assessing whether: (i) the complainant was actually harassed, (ii) SO knew or was reckless as to the harassment, and (iii) the complainant’s fear for her safety was reasonable. While mutual contact does not automatically mean there was no harassment, in these circumstances I doubt whether SO would have known his behaviour was harassing the complainant. It is also doubtful that SO was reckless or willfully blind as to whether his conduct was harassing. While AP may have subjectively feared for her safety, I have concern with the reasonableness of those fears given the nature of her contact with SO, the fact that it was mutual in most instances, and the absence of any threatening behaviour. Much of the contact post breakup would have been from SO asking whether he may contact AP when he returns to the province. I note that once notified of a complaint by SIRT-NL, SO refrained from any further contact with AP. I also note that there is no evidence to suggest that SO: (i) followed AP, (ii) beset or watched AP’s home, or (iii) repeatedly contacted anyone known to AP.

2. Harassing Communications

The allegation of harassing communications centers around forty-four calls received by AP between April 5 to May 29, 2025, from an unknown number. During the investigation, the SIRT-NL Investigator compared the screenshots of all the unknown calls that AP received to the phone records provided by SO from his personal cell phone number. There were no matching records of SO's cell phone contacting AP on the dates alleged. Results from a Production Order indicate that the calls from an unknown number originated from another person. AP advises that she had an intermittent relationship with that other person starting in January 2024 which ended in February 2025. Given the results of the Production Order and the review of the phone records obtained from SO, there is no evidence to suggest that SO made any harassing communications to AP.

3. Perjury

The final allegation stems from SO's testimony at a Peace Bond Hearing on May 2, 2025. Under section 131 of the **Criminal Code**, a person commits perjury when:

131 (1) Subject to subsection (3), everyone commits perjury who, with intent to mislead, makes before a person who is authorized by law to permit it to be made before him a false statement under oath or solemn affirmation, by affidavit, solemn declaration or deposition or orally, knowing that the statement is false.

The offence of perjury involves the following elements:

1. The testimony was under oath.
2. The statement was false.
3. The accused knew it was false.
4. The intent was to mislead.

When asked under oath at the peace bond hearing whether he accessed RCMP PROS, SO admitted that he did it once in order to access AP's tombstone data (i.e., name, DOB, and address). He said he did this because "he was curious." SO also stated that he believed that he conducted this search some time in November when he was still in a relationship with AP. This testimony is not consistent with a PROS audit conducted by the RCMP. This audit confirms that SO conducted inquiries on AP on two separate dates (September 24, 2024, and October 17, 2024). On October 17, he accessed an external document in a file involving AP, which may have included injury photos of AP.

The first two elements of a perjury offence are clearly met—SO testified under solemn affirmation before a Provincial Court Judge and the fact that it was false is supported by the PROS Audit Log, which shows that SO accessed AP's information on two occasions, contradicting his claim that he did so only once and viewed only basic "tombstone" data.

While the first two elements of the offence have been established, I am not convinced that there is sufficient evidence to conclude that SO knew his testimony was false or that he intended to mislead. The inconsistencies in SO's testimony may be attributed to memory lapses, especially given his mental health and alcohol issues at the time. SO's testimony included uncertainty about dates, suggesting a lack of deliberate deception. Further, SO admitted to accessing AP's information in PROS which by itself was a significant admission that could have potential career consequences. As such, there was no apparent motive or benefit to misleading the court, given that the inaccuracies by themselves would likely not have affected the outcome of the peace bond hearing.

I have not formulated reasonable grounds to believe that SO knowingly gave false testimony with the intent to mislead.

SIRT-NL will now conclude this file.

Final Report prepared by:

Stephen Ring, Director
Serious Incident Response Team - Newfoundland and Labrador
September 15, 2025
File No. 2025-0001