

## THE PROVINCIAL COURT OF MANITOBA

BETWEEN:	)	Mr. M. Paluk,
	)	for the Complainant
L.M.,	)	
Complainant,	)	Mr. K. Labossiere,
- and -	)	for the Respondent
	)	
DETECTIVE SERGEANT	)	
R.T.,	)	Judgment delivered
Respondent.	)	September 7, 2006

CORRIN, P.J. (Orally)

Normally, I would reserve and normally I would probably write a decision, but essentially what I have before me is what we call in the criminal courts a joint recommendation. We have the respective parties before the court in full acknowledgment of the misconduct recommending that the penalty be an admonition. Obviously, there is jurisprudence supporting that. Obviously, we're dealing with somebody who has expressed a full apology, has taken a proactive approach to the complaint insofar as he has not only apologized prior to the hearing, but he has also acknowledged his misconduct in a timely fashion.

He has a long service history with the Winnipeg Police Service. Obviously, for the most part, it is probably exceptional. I think there are no blemishes on his employment history with the Winnipeg Police Service.

This court has no difficulty accepting the joint recommendation that Detective Sergeant T. receive an admonition. I am going to direct, pursuant to s.28 of the Act that the Chief of Police is directed to impose the admonition on the respondent's service record. That will record that the respondent was found to have committed a disciplinary default under the act by having abused his authority by using abusive language.

That brings the matter to an end.

NOTE: For the purposes of distribution, personal information has been removed by the commissioner.

**Reviewed - Release authorized by Corrin, P.J.**