

From: Payne, Jennifer (JUS)
Sent: September 22, 2009 6:51 PM
To: Flindall, Robert (JUS)
Subject: Read this occurrence tonite

Importance: High

SP05112642

And yes it is who you're thinking it is.....he worked there. But he was never linked to the occurrence. So when doing his background this would have never come up or been found!

Jen:)

S/Sgt Campbell

25 Sep 09

Attached is P/C Jack's response to his 6 month evaluation. He is willing to sign it but when I checked the file it has already moved ahead.

This could just be sent on or added to his current one or merged into his current one.

I'll leave with you

Thanks

Pete



Sgt Fenwick

I understand you spoke to Insp. [unclear] on 050909
& wanted a copy of this. [unclear]

Re: Probationary Constable Performance Evaluation Report (PCS-066P)

JACK, Michael, Badge # 12690

Report Month: 6

Evaluation period: 09 June 2009 to 09 August 2009

Preamble: In early May 2009, I advised Sgt. Flindall that I did not feel I was getting the proper coaching and that I felt I had no one to go to for help. He acknowledged my concerns and explained to me that it was the result of the mismanagement of human resources at the detachment and that Cst. Shaun Filman was not supposed to be my coach officer in the first place and that he was assigned to be my coach shortly prior to my reporting at the detachment. I was Cst. Filman's 3rd probationary back-to-back, he just had a son and as the result his mind was elsewhere. I advised Sgt. Flindall that I was concerned about my probationary period progress and that I did not want to jeopardize my probationary period because of the mismanagement of resources, which was obviously beyond my control. Sgt. Flindall reassured me that this was not going to happen on his shift. Sgt. Flindall advised me that Cst. Filman was going to continue to be my official coach officer and as such, will continue to be responsible for writing my evaluations. While Cst. Payne was going to be my "go-to" person and was going to assist me with work. Obviously, this did not work.

My PCS-066P for month 2 (evaluation period 09 Jan 2009 – 09 Mar 2009) was presented to me by Sgt. Flindall on April 26, 2009. There were 3 "Does Not Meet Requirements" ratings and 3 work improvement plans. The PCS-066P was overdue by a month and a half. Sgt. Flindall advised me that this was his fault and reassured me that this was not going to happen again.

My PCS-066P for month 3 (evaluation period 09 Mar 2009 – 09 Apr 2009) was presented to me by Sgt. Flindall on April 26, 2009 together with PCS-066P for month 2.

My PCS-066P for month 4 (evaluation period 09 Apr 2009 – 09 May 2009) was presented to me by Sgt. Flindall on May 14, 2009.

My PCS-066P for month 5 (evaluation period 09 May 2009 – 09 June 2009) was presented to me by Sgt. Flindall on August 19, 2009, which was overdue by two months.

On August 19, 2009 I had a meeting with S/Sgt. Campbell and Sgt. Flindall with OPPA representative, Cst. Anderson sitting in on it. At the meeting I was informed that I was being re-assigned to another platoon with another coach officer and that I would report back for duty on September 9, 2009; after my vacation that commences on August 20, 2009 at 18:00 hrs. Further, I was informed by Sgt. Flindall that he was going to give me two more 233-10 and that it would be reflected in my next evaluation.

On August 20, 2009 shortly before noon, I got a call in reference to a suspected impaired driver (SP09191712). I subsequently intercepted and arrested the driver for impaired operation of motor vehicle (the driver's breath test result was 272 BAC) and was busy dealing with the prisoner and the paper work all afternoon. At 17:40 hrs (which was 20 minutes prior to the end of my shift), I was presented by Sgt. Flindall yet again, my PCS-066P for month 6 (evaluation period 09 June 2009 – 09 August 2009) along with two 233-

10 and was told to review and sign them "hopefully" before 18:00 hrs. Upon reviewing the PCS-066P, there were 10 "Does Not Meet Requirements" ratings. I only had 3 "Does Not Meet Requirements" in the first two months of my probation period. I was in shock about how negative my evaluation was and needed time to think of how to respond to it. The evaluator's name on the form was Cst. Filman (who was at the time on vacation) yet all the negative comments were thoroughly documented by Sgt. Flindall. The work improvement plans were not there and I felt I was being slammed with everything all-at-once.

At 18:00 hrs I called D/Cst. Karen German, who is the President of the 8th Branch OPPA and sought advice. D/Cst. German advised me that I did not have to sign anything at the time and advised me she was going to look into my case. I did not sign any of the forms Sgt. Flindall gave me. I told him that I needed more time to review the PCS-066P and that I wanted an OPPA rep to look at them as well. I also told him that I would sign the 233-10 if he ordered me to do so, to which he replied, "Nope" and put "Refused to Sign" instead of my signature. That was the end of our meeting that concluded at approximately 18:10 hrs.

On August 21, 2009 at approximately 10:00 hrs I spoke with Cst. Anderson on the phone. He advised me that it was only fair for me to have some time to go over my evaluation and that I did not have to sign either 233-10 or the PCS-066P on such a short notice. I advised him that I spoke with D/Cst. German and asked him to advise S/Sgt. Campbell of the situation, to which he replied he would.

I have been working on my own since April 2009. During the busy summer months, there have been a number of occasions when I worked alone in my zone throughout the entire day. Also, during my evaluation period (09 June 2009 to 09 August 2009) I had a total of 40 reportable calls for service as a reporting officer and 10 non-reportable. In addition I had 5 calls for service in which I took part either as an assisting officer, an arresting officer, or a fingerprinting officer. During the same time period (09 June 2009 to 09 August 2009) my zone partners, which were my coach officer, Cst. Filman, and my "go-to" person, Cst. Payne, had a total of 37 reportable calls for service together, 20 and 17, respectively; and 35 non-reportable, 10 and 25, respectively.

Provincial Statutes Rating: Does Not Meet Requirements

The narrative is true except for the fact that I did not make the decision to take the female to the hospital for an evaluation. I was the first one on scene, followed by Cst. Crowder, then by Cst. D'Amico and Cst. Moran. Upon arrival, Cst. D'Amico said that she knew the female and that she was crazy. After Cst. D'Amico and Cst. Moran cleared the scene, I was not sure how to clear the call off and that is why I sought advice from Cst. Crowder, who has got 20+ years of service on me. When Cst. Crowder asked me what I would do, I advised Cst. Crowder that though I remembered studying police apprehension authorities under the Mental Health Act at the Ontario Police College, this was my first call of that particular nature. Cst. Crowder explained to me how the call should have been handled and cleared off. I therefore disagree with the "Does Not Meet Requirements" rating as I sought and followed advice of a senior officer.

Federal Statutes

Rating: Does Not Meet Requirements

SP09178964 - After the apprehension and the arrest of the 4 male suspects, Sgt. Flindall asked all the officers at the scene if anyone wanted to lead the investigation. No one volunteered. I had not handled criminal cases of this nature before yet said that I could do it if I got assistance with handling the case. Sgt. Flindall advised me that it would be a team effort in which everybody would take on a piece of work. Upon arrival at the detachment I found out through Niche RMS that the investigation was assigned to me. In regards to me not trusting a supervisor or a senior member with direction stems from the fact that I had been reprimanded before for following directions from a senior officer (see **Listening Skills**) as well as for not asking for help when I needed it. My coach officer was not available at the time to assist me with the investigation and the required paper work. Therefore, at that point after everything that had gone on, I did not know who to seek advice from or who I could trust. Further to this, I asked Sgt. Flindall through email once and verbally 3 times for a copy of his notes from the evening's event, as Sgt. Flindall arrested one male suspect at the scene and I needed his notes to complete the crown brief synopsis. Sgt. Flindall acknowledged my requests but never gave me his notes. I was therefore unable to complete the crown brief synopsis prior to going on vacation on August 20, 2009. I advised Sgt. Flindall that I was willing to come to work during my time off to complete the investigation, to which he replied he wanted me to have a vacation and that he would take care of the investigation and ordered me to surrender to him the 4 crown briefs that I had put together, which I did.

Listening Skills

Rating: Does Not Meet Requirements

SP09087157 - With respect to the handling of the Fraud investigation, see **Follow-Up Orientation**.

SP09164458 - On July 23, 2009 at 18:40 hrs I was ordered by Sgt. Flindall to work on overtime to complete the Criminal Harassment case I was assigned to work on earlier that day. First and foremost I was 13 hours into my day shift when the order to stay at the detachment to continue working on overtime was given. Second, I had not handled criminal cases of this nature before and therefore lacked the necessary skills or experience to handle the investigation on my own in such a short time frame. Sgt. Flindall gave me a set of instructions on a piece of paper to follow and advised me that the night shift were going to assist me. Further, Sgt. Flindall advised me that the night shift supervisor (2IC) Cst. Hanna had been advised to track the accused down and arrest him. Despite being exhausted, not having eaten all day and not having the experience to complete the required paper work in a given time frame, I did not dispute Sgt. Flindall's order and stayed at work. I took an energy pill to keep me awake, got a meal from Wendy's and a set of headphones from Staples and continued working. I did transcribe the video statement and put the general occurrence report as it helped me to determine and put the facts-in-issue in writing. I then photocopied my notes and the evidence provided by the complainants and at around 22:00 hrs asked Cst. Brokley, who was on light duties that night, to assist me with putting Crown Brief Synopsis as I was mentally and physically exhausted and could no longer comprehend what I was doing. Cst. Brokley advised me he could not do that as Crown Brief Synopsis should be written by the investigating officer and instead offered me his help with the preparation of the PTAs. I advised Cst. Brokley that this is not what Sgt. Flindall told me to do and showed him a piece of paper with Sgt. Flindall's instructions. Cst. Brokley in turn advised me that since the

accused did not have a criminal record, he could be arrested and released on a PTA and that he was going to prepare the PTA for me. At around 23:00 hrs I called Cst. Hanna on the on-duty sergeant's phone and inquired whether the accused had been arrested. Cst. Hanna advised me that the last message he got was not to arrest the accused and that he did not dispatch any officers from the night shift to arrest the accused. I advised him that this not what Sgt. Flindall advised me and that I expected the night shift to help me. Cst. Hanna in turn advised me that this was "bullshit" and that the accused should have been contacted over the phone and asked to attend the detachment earlier in the evening to turn himself in. Cst. Hanna further advised me that he was on a call enroute to Bancroft and could not be of any assistance to me at the time. In light of this information, Cst. Brokley advised me to send an email to the detachment in reference to the occurrence, should the accused be arrested overnight and that he was going to prepare the PTA and leave two copies in my diary slot. I sent an email as advised and at around midnight obtained S/Sgt. Campbell's permission, who happened to be at the detachment at the time, to go home and come back the following morning (Friday, July 24, 2009) to work overtime to complete the investigation. When S/Sgt. Campbell looked at me he told me, "Go home Mike, you are spinning wheels now". I left the detachment at around 01:00 hrs and came back to work in the morning at around 10:00 hrs. The accused was not arrested overnight. With a fresh mind I finalized the Crown Brief Synopsis. Though Cst. Brokley did prepare the PTA and left two copies in my diary slot, I had to prepare the PTA from scratch as it was erroneous and was not even saved in the Niche RMS. At around noon, I learned from the complainant's husband that the accused was employed as a land surveyor and was supposed to be at work at a road construction site in the vicinity of the Peterborough County OPP detachment that day. I sought advice from the day shift supervisor (2IC) Cst. Postma how to handle the arrest (I only had one arrest, for Over 80, on my own prior to that day) and then attempted to locate the accused. At the construction site I located a co-worker of the accused and learned from him that the accused had left for the day. I was subsequently able to get hold of the accused on the phone at his father's place and requested him to attend the detachment. At the detachment I arrested him on the charge of Criminal Harassment and released him on PTA. At around 18:30 hrs I attended his residence and in his presence seized his 15 registered firearms under Sec. 117.04 CC. I got assistance from the night shift with the lodging of the 15 seized firearms and concluded my overtime day shift at 23:00 hrs. I disagree with this rating as I lacked the necessary knowledge to deal with a criminal case of this nature; I was mentally and physically exhausted and felt abandoned. Once again, I took the advice of the senior officer and therefore I was reassured I was doing the right thing.

Radio Communications

Rating: Does Not Meet Requirements

SP09152940 – SP09158516 – With respect to the "follow-up", see **Self-Awareness**.

By definition, the **Radio Communications** section rates the "use of appropriate and respectful language when utilizing the communications system, effective communication, and the usage of 10 codes." I therefore do not understand how the above example fits into the definition of **Radio Communications**.

Resolution

Rating: Does Not Meet Requirements

The narrative is only partially true as first I attended the "stand-by and keep the peace" call on my own as to the best of my knowledge at the time, all other zone units were tied up with other calls for service. Second, I was unaware that one of the involved parties contacted the PCC and requested another officer to attend. When I realized things were not progressing, I called Cst. Payne and requested back-up. Cst. Payne advised me that she was sending Cst. Filman to assist me. When Cst. Filman arrived, he resolved the matter.

Follow-Up Orientation

Rating: Does Not Meet Requirements

SP09087157 - First and foremost; my understanding of the investigation was that I was to assist in the investigation and not to lead it. In proof of this, in my evaluation report for month 4 (09 April 2009 to 09 May 2009) in the *Analytical Thinking* section Cst. Filman indicated that I completed a detailed investigation including a photo line-up and had since turned the investigation over to the regional intelligence officer. I was later advised by Sgt. Flindall that the investigation was mine and that I was supposed to lead it to completion. Due to the complexity of the investigation (for my level of experience) I asked Sgt. Flindall for assistance and he advised me that Cst. Payne was going to assist me with it. On July 18, 2009, Cst. Payne and myself sat down to look at what I had done in regards to the investigation and what remained to be done. Cst. Payne quickly proof read my General Occurrence Report, advised me that property items needed to be added to Niche RMS, synopsis of the video statement completed, crown brief synopsis completed and all my notes photocopied. I got no more than half-an-hour altogether of Cst. Payne assistance with the case. I did transcribe the witness video statement contrary to Cst. Payne instruction just to prepare a summary of it. However, during the transcription, I discovered that the actual fraudulent transaction was rung through by another person (a cashier) and that was something neither I nor Cst. Payne was aware of. While I was present during the interview of the Customer Service Representative (CSR), who serviced the accused and was the witness to the fraud, when D/Cst. Dawson conducted the interview, my understating was that I was the assisting officer in the investigation and therefore I did not intervene in the photo lineup procedure and in the questioning of the CSR. When however, I transcribed the video statement verbatim, I learned that there was a cashier who physically rung the fraudulent transaction through. Had I not transcribed the video statement verbatim, no one would have known that there was another key witness to the event and that her statements needed to be obtained. Only when I showed the verbatim transcription of the video statement to Cst. Payne, she pointed out that Crown Attorney Brian Gilkinson would return the Crown Brief back to me if I did not have statements from the cashier. I therefore got reprimanded for wasting the time on the verbatim transcription of the video statement of the CSR, however, nothing was mentioned about me coming across the fact that the CSR was not the one who rung the fraudulent transaction through and that there was another key witness to the fraud that need to be interviewed. Further to this, when I attended the business to interview the cashier, I was told that there were two cashiers who rung two separate fraudulent transactions conducted by the same accused on the same day and that one of them lived outside of Peterborough County territorial division. I was further advised that both of them were scheduled to work on July 24, 2009 and therefore would be available for the interview. In light of the recent experience of being dispatched to calls almost immediately after going on duty and

not being able to do follow ups with people from calls from previous shifts in a timely manner, I asked Sgt. Flindall for a permission to attend the business to interview the witnesses on my day off on my own time, to which he stated there was a liability issue with that and denied my request. I therefore arranged to meet with both cashiers on July 27, 2009 at 19:00 hrs at the business. Sgt. Flindall was going to be on vacation that day and advised me to advise Cst. Payne that I was going to interview the cashiers as soon as I went on duty and that it was my number one priority. I subsequently met with the cashiers at the scheduled time and successfully interviewed them.

Personal Accountability Rating: Does Not Meet Requirements

SP09164458 – With respect to the handling of the Criminal Harassment investigation, see **Listening Skills**. It appears that the same case is being used more than once to negatively rate my performance across multiple evaluation criteria.

Planning and Organizing Rating: Does Not Meet Requirements

SP09164458 – With respect to the handling of the Criminal Harassment investigation, see **Listening Skills**. It appears that the same case is being used more than once to negatively rate my performance across multiple evaluation criteria.

In regard to my perceived inability to multitask I would like to reiterate over the fact that during my evaluation period (09 June 2009 to 09 August 2009) I had a total of 40 reportable calls for service as a reporting officer and 10 non-reportable. In addition I had 5 calls for service in which I took part either as an assisting officer, an arresting officer, or a fingerprinting officer. During the same time period (09 June 2009 to 09 August 2009) my team partners which were my coach officer, Cst. Tillman, and my "go-to" person, Cst. Payne, had a total of 37 reportable calls for service together, 20 and 17 respectively, and 35 non-reportable, 10 and 25 respectively. It therefore comes as yet another surprise to learn that I cannot multitask when I took, handled and completed more reportable calls than both my coach officer and my "go-to" person combined.

Respectful Relationships Rating: Does Not Meet Requirements

SP09178964 – With respect to the B&E in progress, see **Federal Statutes**. It appears that the same case is being used more than once to negatively rate my performance across multiple evaluation criteria.

Self-Confidence

Rating: Does Not Meet Requirements

I am not sure what these numerous situations were that required disciplinary action and what kind of disciplinary action was required or taken to complete my tasks properly. During my conversation with Sgt. Flindall on August 3, 2009 I was advised that I am a quite person and should be asking questions when I do not know how to deal with a situation. It therefore comes as yet another surprise to learn that I got reprimanded for requiring instruction to complete tasks properly. Should I naturally require instruction to complete certain tasks during my probationary period and perhaps even later in my career? Is not that the job of a coach officer to provide me with instruction and guidance in the first place? Is not that exactly what I discussed with Sgt. Flindall in May 2009? As for the criticism, I am not sure who that person was that I was avoiding and when it happened. If that person comes forth, I then will be able to explain my perceived behaviour of avoidance.

Self-Awareness

Rating: Meets Requirements

SP09152940 -- SP09158516: On July 11, 2009 there was an email sent to the detachment by an officer from another shift about racial graffiti on a vehicle at Camp MOSHAVA (which is a Jewish camp), in which patrols in the area were requested. I took note of the incident, like I do about many other ones that occur in Peterborough County and especially in my zone. On the morning of July 17, 2009, I was on general patrol in my zone, when I noticed I was in the vicinity of the camp. I recalled the request for extra patrols and decided to conduct one to see where the camp was located and to familiarize myself with the area. Upon my arrival at the camp's main gate, I was greeted by the camp security guard who said, "You are already here." I asked what he meant and he explained that a teenaged female at the camp fainted and EMS was called. He further advised me that he was not sure if the police had been called. Shortly thereafter Peterborough EMS and local fire arrived on scene. I personally knew the paramedics and the firemen as we had worked together on a number of motor vehicle accidents. I decided to stay until they cleared the scene in case police assistance was required. The teenaged female was brought out in a camp van, examined by paramedics and transported to the hospital for further examination. I then spoke with the camp manager and I advised her of the reason I was there and that I had a Jewish background. I further asked if I could get some water and she took me into the dining room. We had a short conversation (5-10 min), in which she advised me of the thefts they had had from cabins and the racial graffiti. I advised her that I was aware of the racial graffiti occurrence and that was the reason I had learned about their location and was conducting the requested patrols. Our conversation was interrupted by me receiving a call and being dispatched to a B&E in another zone. I left the camp manager my business card, apologized for leaving in the middle of the conversation, and left.

We have been encouraged to conduct foot patrols in our respective zones. On the morning of July 17, 2009, I was in my zone and I was conducting a foot patrol. I had advised PCC earlier that I was in my zone, however, I did not advise PCC of my exact location and that I was out of the vehicle. I am not sure if what I did was a follow up or not, but I was not aware of any wrong doing on my part.

Date: 09-SEP-09

Signature:





GENERAL INFORMATION FORM

Bureau / Region Central	
Date: 02 August - 15 August 2009	
Member JACK, M	Badge # 12690
Supervisor FLINDALL, R	Badge # 9740
CRITERIA	SUB CATEGORIES
Job Knowledge & Skills <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Attitude Towards Learning <input type="checkbox"/>
Problem Solving <input type="checkbox"/>	
Communication Skills <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Effective Listening Skills
Leadership Skills <input type="checkbox"/>	//////////
Interpersonal Attributes <input type="checkbox"/>	//////////
Personal Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Dependability
Other <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Judgement
RATING	
Does Not Meet Requirements	

NARRATIVE (Incident # Optional)

SP09178964

On the 2nd of August 2009, PC JACK was spoken to by his coach officer PC S. FILMAN and his Sergeant, R. FLINDALL in regards to complaints received from his peers that PC JACK is constantly "shopping for answers". Complaints were received not only from his platoon mates, but also officers from other shifts. At this time, he was advised to cease and desist and that if advice is given by his coach officer or Sergeant, he is to follow this direction.

On the 6th of August 2009, PC JACK as well as other members of the Peterborough County OPP Detachment were called to a break and enter in progress at the abandoned Young's Point Public School. PC JACK was involved in the successful apprehension of 3 youths and 1 adult who had broken into the school and caused mischief.

PC JACK completed video statements with each accused and one of the accused parties provided a cautioned inculpatory statement, admitting they had broken into the school, broken some windows and toppled over the brick chimney.



GENERAL INFORMATION FORM

PC JACK was provided with guidance by Sgt. R. FLINDALL as well as his peers in regards to the appropriate charges to lay - those being break, enter and mischief as well as a number of misc. other charges.

On the 8th of August 2009, PC JACK had occasion to work on another platoon for shift coverage. During his shift, PC JACK approached another officer asking him questions in regards to the break and enter. PC JACK explained to this officer that he did not feel that the charges of break and enter were warranted as they had only found the suspects on the school roof and did not have evidence that they had broken into the school. PC JACK felt that they should have only been charged with trespassing. Another officer who was present was familiar with the matter and it was upon his intervention that PC JACK admitted to the inculpatory statement, including the multiple hits to interior alarms in the school. The officers were upset that PC JACK provided misleading information to them and had them provide advice based on that information. The provided PC JACK with a definition of break and enter and advised him to speak with Sgt. R. FLINDALL about any future concerns.

At shift briefing on the 10th of August 2009, PC JACK brought up his concern that he felt the appropriate charges were only trespassing. Sgt. R. FLINDALL again explained to him why the appropriate charges were laid.

On the 15th of August 2009, PC R. PARADIS was instructing PC JACK on how to properly complete informations using the Niche RMS system. PC R. PARADIS had just completed a secondment to the court office and was in the process of teaching fellow officers how to write informations. During this instruction, PC JACK and PC PARADIS were reviewing the break and enter information and crown brief synopsis. In his synopsis, PC JACK wrote that it was believed the suspects were in the school. PC PARADIS advised him that he should not write "believed they had been in the school" if he knows they were in the school. PC JACK advised PC PARADIS that he didn't know if they were in the school. PC PARADIS asked him why he was laying the charge to which PC JACK advised him that he was told to. Again, PC JACK provided less than truthful information to a senior officer by omitting the fact that he had a confession in place as well as other evidence.

In both cases, on the 8th and 15th, the officers involved approached Sgt. R. FLINDALL and provided him with their concerns. Both officers indicated that they did not trust PC JACK to provide truthful information.

On the 19th of August 2009, PC JACK was spoken to by S/Sgt. R. CAMPBELL and Sgt. R. FLINDALL about continuing to shop for answers, specifically when he was given direction by his Sergeant. PC JACK was accompanied by the Detachment OPPA rep PC M. ANDERSON. PC JACK was also spoken to about how he willfully omitted information while attempting to elicit advice from his fellow officers. In both cases, he was advised to stop immediately and to seek advice or further guidance in relation to matters from his coach officer or Sergeant.

PC JACK has been deemed not to meet requirements in the above categories.



GENERAL INFORMATION FORM

20 August 2009

DISCLOSURE DATE:

DISCLOSED BY:

Sgt. R. FLINDALL

MEMBER'S SIGNATURE



GENERAL INFORMATION FORM

Bureau / Region Central

Date: 15 August 2009

Member JACK, Michael	Badge # 12690
Supervisor FLINDALL, Robert	Badge # 9740

CRITERIA	SUB CATEGORIES
Job Knowledge & Skills <input type="checkbox"/>	Attitude Towards Learning <input type="checkbox"/>
Problem Solving <input type="checkbox"/>	
Communication Skills <input type="checkbox"/>	//////////
Leadership Skills <input type="checkbox"/>	//////////
Interpersonal Attributes <input type="checkbox"/>	//////////
Personal Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	//////////
Other <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Police Vehicle Operations

RATING
Does Not Meet Requirements

NARRATIVE (Incident # Optional)
RM09096931

On Saturday the 15th of August 2009, officers of the Peterborough County OPP Detachment attended a residence located on the 14th Line of Smith, Smith-Ennismore-Lakefield Twp in regards to a family dispute. After the call was cleared, Sgt. R. FLINDALL left the scene headed westbound on the 14th Line of Smith and was being followed by PC J. PAYNE and PC M. JACK in turn. The officers came to the intersection of Cty Rd 23 and the 14th Line of Smith and came to a stop. Both Sgt. R. FLINDALL and PC J. PAYNE turned southbound onto Cty Rd 23. Despite southbound traffic approaching the intersection, PC M. JACK also turned onto Cty Rd 23 with the intent to head southbound. As a result, southbound traffic had to brake hard to avoid colliding with PC M. JACK's cruiser and PC M. JACK had to take evasive maneuvers by turning hard into the north bound lane. PC M. JACK continued southbound in the northbound lane and had to accelerate in order to get ahead of the traffic and pull back into the southbound lane. PC M. JACK's driving was dangerous to not only himself but to the motoring public as well.



GENERAL INFORMATION FORM

On the 14th of August, 2009, at 1255hrs, the day before, Sgt. R. FLINDALL had served PC M. JACK with the Commissioner's memo concerning cruiser collisions and officer driving safety. As a result he has been charged under S. 136(1)(A) HTA - Fail to yield to through traffic on highway.

Also on the 15th of August, 2009, Sgt. R. FLINDALL received an email from court officer John HOBBS dated the 12th of August, through Sgt. T. BANBURY. PC J. HOBBS outlines a conversation he had with an upset court clerk (unnamed at her request) who advised that PC JACK had attended her residence looking for a male party. The court clerk did not have issue with PC M. JACK attending the address, as he had the incorrect address, but had an issue with PC M. JACK using her front lawn to turn his cruiser around to leave the driveway. Although there was no permanent damage to her lawn, the cruiser left tire marks across her lawn.

PC M. JACK has been spoken to about his driving behaviour and it's potentially serious consequences should his driving behaviour continue. His file has been appropriately documented and his police cruiser operations has been deemed to not meet requirements.

DISCLOSURE DATE: August 15th, 2009

DISCLOSED BY: Sgt. R. FLINDALL #9740

MEMBER'S SIGNATURE

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Mark', is written over the signature line.