

OPAAC ADJ #26-031

DURHAM REGIONAL POLICE SERVICE
Applicant

And

SERGEANT ROB STODDARD
Respondent

Adjudicator:
Emily Cole

Appearances:
A. Sinclair, for the applicant
J. Mulcahy, April-September, 2026; L. Gridin, July 2025-April 2026, for the respondent

Heard:
July 29, 2025-April 21, 2026 (10 dates)

Date of decision:
September 16, 2026

Length of decision:
5 pp.

Statutory citations:
Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019, S.O. 2019, c. 1, Sched. 1, ss. 198, 202, 206(1)
O. Reg. 407/23, s. 31
Police Services Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P. 15 (repealed)

DECEIT - False or misleading statements - Applicant alleged respondent made several false or misleading statements during compelled interview - Applicant sought termination of respondent's employment - Respondent retiring before merits hearing commenced - Pursuant to s. 206 of *Community Safety and Policing Act*, matter dismissed due to lack of jurisdiction.

RESIGNATION - Respondent facing several allegations of misconduct in connection with compelled interview - Respondent retiring before merits hearing commenced - Pursuant to s. 206 of *Community Safety and Policing Act*, matter dismissed due to lack of jurisdiction.

JURISDICTION - Adjudicators - Effect of resignation before disciplinary measure imposed - Pursuant to s. 206 of *Community Safety and Policing Act*, matter dismissed due to lack of jurisdiction.

Summary of Reasons for Decision

The respondent, Sgt. Stoddard, was the subject of a misconduct investigation initiated under the now-repealed *Police Services Act*. In the instant proceeding, under s. 202 of the *Community Safety and Policing Act*, the applicant alleged that during a compelled interview with Professional Standards investigators on May 16, 2024, Sgt. Stoddard made several deceitful and/or misleading statements, in violation of s. 31 of the Code of Conduct, O. Reg. 407/23. Specifically, the applicant alleged that the respondent falsely denied certain improper interactions with a subordinate civilian employee and made deceitful/misleading statements about his handling of his service-issued firearm. In the s. 202 proceeding, the applicant sought termination of Sgt. Stoddard's employment.

Thus, because the disciplinary proceedings spanned two statutes, the respondent was also the subject of a companion proceeding under the *Police Services Act*. The *PSA* allegations were the subject of the compelled interview, during which the respondent was said to have made the impugned statements.

In the s. 202 proceeding, after several appearances by videoconference before the adjudicator, the parties agreed that the *PSA* matter would proceed first. The *PSA* hearing was scheduled to begin on September 14, 2026. One day later, the applicant advised that Sgt. Stoddard had retired effective September 14, 2026.

Accordingly, pursuant to s. 206 of the *CSPA*, the adjudicator dismissed the matter due to a lack of jurisdiction.

Authorities cited
