



REVIEW REPORT 043-2022

Saskatoon Police Service

August 16, 2022

Summary:

The Applicant made an access to information request to the Saskatoon Police Service (SPS) under *The Local Authority Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* (LA FOIP). SPS issued a response pursuant to section 7 of LA FOIP denying access to portions of the record pursuant to sections 14(1)(c), (j) and 28(1) of LA FOIP. SPS stated that the Applicant could view the video records at its office. The Applicant requested that the Commissioner review SPS' decision, the adequacy of SPS' search for records, and the manner of providing access. The Commissioner found that SPS did not respond within the legislated timeline, its decision to offer view access to the video footage was appropriate and its search was reasonable. The Commissioner also found that SPS appropriately applied sections 14(1)(c), (j), and 28(1) of LA FOIP in some cases. The Commissioner recommended SPS release some of the withheld information and continue to withhold the remaining information.

I BACKGROUND

[1] On December 16, 2021, the Saskatoon Police Service (SPS) received an access to information request from the Applicant which stated:

Firstly, I am requesting all records, reports, notes, communications, audio/video recordings(s), from a traffic stop involving 3 officers and myself that happened on April 20, 2021 on Smallwood Crescent around 0500hrs. One of the officers was [Name of Constable], however I do not know the names of the other male and female officers. I need full disclosure from each officer from beginning to end, whatever is available. I need physical copies of everything for my personal record.

I also would like records for any and all traffic stops dating back as far as what is available. I specifically need the information from 2014-Present, involving any of the following vehicles; 2008 Nissan Altima (Black) [Lic. (number)], 2008 Volkswagen

Golf (White), 2015 Volkswagen Golf (White), 2001 Volkswagen Jetta VR6 (Black), 2001 Honda Civic Si (Black). There was an initial stop that occurred around 2014 or 2015 for “Driving too fast for conditions” on or around Campus Drive (near Subway Restaurant).

I also need information involving an arrest for which I was never charged but may have initially been reported as ‘public intoxication’. I was arrested in the parking lot of the Colonial Pub on 8th street and spent the night at the police station on 4th Avenue North. The arresting officer was female, though I don't recall her name. I need any available records, reports, footage, communications involving any and all the previously mentioned occurrences.

[2] SPS responded to the access to information request on January 19, 2022, releasing some information and withholding other information pursuant to sections 14(1)(c), (j), and 28(1) of *The Local Authority Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* (LA FOIP). It also stated that some of the requested records no longer exist.

[3] On February 24, 2022, the Applicant asked my office to review SPS’ decision.

[4] On March 22, 2022, my office notified the Applicant and SPS of my office’s intention to conduct a review and invited both parties to provide a submission on whether SPS responded to the access to information request within the legislated timelines, the reasonableness of the search for records, and how portions of the records qualify for exemption pursuant to sections 14(1)(c), (j), and 28(1) of LA FOIP.

[5] On May 2, 2022, SPS provided my office with an index of records and copies of the records at issue. It also provided the Applicant with a revised response to their access to information request. The revised response stated that it was releasing additional records as the Public Complaints Commission investigation had concluded. Consequently, one record was released in full and additional portions of other records were released. SPS stated that it continued to rely on sections 14(1)(c), (j) and 28(1) of LA FOIP to withhold the remaining information.

[6] In its revised response, SPS stated that the Applicant should make an appointment to view the video footage from its In-Car Camera system (ICC). It cited section 10(3)(c) of LA

FOIP as authority to release the video records in this manner. As the Applicant wanted to receive a copy of the video footage, the manner of access was made an issue in this review.

[7] On May 16, 2022, SPS provided my office with its submission. The Applicant did not file a submission.

II RECORDS AT ISSUE

[8] SPS identified 28 responsive records namely, six Occurrence Reports, 17 traffic tickets and five videos. Full access was granted to the traffic tickets and two videos. Access was granted to portions of the remaining nine records. The records remaining at issue, the exemptions claimed, and my findings are set out in Appendix A to this Report.

III DISCUSSION OF THE ISSUES

1. Do I have jurisdiction?

[9] SPS qualifies as a “local authority” as defined by section 2(f)(viii.1) of LA FOIP. Therefore, I have jurisdiction to review this matter.

2. Did SPS respond to the Applicant within the legislated timeline?

[10] Section 7(2) of LA FOIP provides that a local authority must respond to an access to information request within 30 days of receiving it unless the deadline for the response was extended pursuant to section 12 of LA FOIP. Section 7(2) of LA FOIP states, in part:

7(2) The head shall give written notice to the applicant within 30 days after the application is made:

[11] SPS received the Applicant’s access to information request on December 16, 2021, and responded to it on January 19, 2022. In its submission, SPS acknowledged that it failed to respond within the legislated timeline. I find that SPS did not respond to the Applicant

within the 30-day legislated timeline and therefore failed to comply with section 7(2) of LA FOIP.

[12] I recommend that SPS review its policies, procedures, and training programs to ensure that it meets the legislated timelines under LA FOIP.

3. Did SPS conduct a reasonable search for records?

[13] Section 5 of LA FOIP provides an applicant with a right of access to records in the possession or control of a local authority. Section 5.1(1) of LA FOIP requires a local authority to respond to an applicant's access to information request openly, accurately and completely. This means that local authorities should make reasonable efforts to identify and seek out records responsive to an applicant's access to information request (*Guide to LA FOIP*, Chapter 3, "Access to Records", updated June 29, 2021, [*Guide to LA FOIP*, Ch. 3], p. 15).

[14] Sections 5 and 5.1(1) of LA FOIP provide:

5 Subject to this Act and the regulations, every person has a right to and, on an application made in accordance with this Part, shall be permitted access to records that are in the possession or under the control of a local authority.

5.1(1) Subject to this Act and the regulations, a local authority shall respond to a written request for access openly, accurately and completely.

[15] The threshold for an adequate search is one of "reasonableness." In other words, it is not a standard of perfection, but rather what a fair and rational person would expect to be done or consider acceptable.

[16] A reasonable search is one in which an employee, experienced in the subject matter of the records, expends a reasonable effort to locate records which are reasonably related to the request. A reasonable effort is the level of effort you would expect of any fair, sensible person searching areas where records are likely to be stored. What is reasonable depends on the request and related circumstances (*Guide to LA FOIP*, Ch. 3, p. 16).

[17] When an applicant requests a review of a local authority's search efforts, the local authority should provide my office with detailed information about its efforts to conduct a search. Following are examples of the type of information that can be provided to my office:

- For personal information requests – explain how the individual is involved with the local authority (i.e. client, employee, former employee etc.) and why certain departments/divisions/branches were included in the search.
- Identify the employee(s) involved in the search and explain how the employee(s) is experienced in the subject matter.
- Explain how the records management system is organized (both paper & electronic) in the departments/divisions/branches included in the search.
- Describe how records are classified within the records management system. For example, are the records classified by:
 - Alphabet
 - Year
 - Function
 - Subject
- Consider providing a copy of your organization's record schedule and screen shots of the electronic directory (folders & subfolders).
- If the record has been destroyed, provide copies of record schedules and/or destruction certificates.
- Explain how you have considered records stored off-site.
- Explain how a search of mobile electronic devices was conducted (i.e. laptops, smart phones, cell phones, tablets).
- Explain which folders within the records management system were searched and how these folders link back to the subject matter requested. For electronic folders – indicate what key terms were used to search if applicable.
- Indicate the calendar dates each employee searched.
- Indicate how long the search took for each employee.
- Indicate what the results were for each employee's search.
- Consider having the employee that is searching provide an affidavit to support the position that no record exists or to support the details provided. For more on this,

see my office's resource, *Using Affidavits in a Review with the IPC*, available on my office's website

(*Guide to LA FOIP*, Ch, 3 pp. 7 - 10)

- [18] SPS asserted its Junior Access and Privacy Officer (APO) conducted a search of the Saskatoon Information Management System (RMS), which is the electronic database where all occurrence reports and tickets are maintained. The system can be searched in various ways. The APO searched the RMS using the Applicant's name and the license plate number provided by the Applicant in their request. These searches were conducted on December 17 and 20, 2021.
- [19] The APO also asked the Audio Video Disclosure Unit for video footage relating to the occurrence reports and ticket numbers. A query was run using the number of the ticket or Occurrence Report, and the date and time of the occurrence on the Arbitrator system for ICC footage and on the Genetec System which maintains video footage taken in the detention center. Searches were conducted on January 11, 19 and 31 of 2022.
- [20] The APO also emailed a member of the service asking for the handwritten notes relating to record 6 (Occurrence Report 2021-35538). In response, the member advised the APO that no notes exist. The total time spent by SPS staff searching for records was 64 minutes.
- [21] SPS asserted that the Applicant appears to believe that video footage from "booking and in-cell" would have been kept from the 2012 occurrence. It stated that current SPS policy provides that video footage from the Arbitrator and Genetec Systems are maintained for 1,125 days unless it is identified for evidentiary or investigative purposes. APO confirmed with the Audio Video Disclosure Unit that this video footage no longer existed.
- [22] Regarding the officers' handwritten notes, SPS asserted it is not uncommon for members to not record notes in the notebooks for traffic stops as the ticket serves as the record for the stop. Where an Occurrence Report is prepared, notes may not be taken as officers may either dictate or type their notes or comments.

- [23] SPS asserted that with respect to record 6 (Occurrence Report 2021-35538), officers should have taken notes and the failure to do so was a contradiction of SPS policy.
- [24] SPS provided my office with sufficient information about the search to support a finding that it conducted a reasonable search for records. It provided information about the record holdings that were searched, employees who were involved in the search, its records management systems, search queries, dates, time taken to conduct the search, and why specific types of records do not exist.
- [25] I have stated that LA FOIP does not require a local authority to prove with absolute certainty that records do not exist, but it must demonstrate that it has conducted a reasonable search. Based on the explanation provided by SPS, I am satisfied it has provided a reasonable explanation for why no additional records exist.
- [26] Considering the detailed information provided to my office about the searches that it conducted, I find that SPS' search for records was reasonable. I recommend it take no further action with respect to search.

4. Did SPS provide access to the record in the appropriate manner?

- [27] Section 10 of LA FOIP sets out how access to a record will be given to applicants. Depending on the type of record, the manner of access can include providing paper copies of records, providing electronic copies or allowing applicants to view a record (*Guide to LA FOIP*, Ch. 3, p. 62).

- [28] Section 10 of LA FOIP provides, in part, as follows:

10(1) If an applicant is entitled to access pursuant to subsection 9(1), a head shall provide the applicant with access to the record in accordance with this section.

(2) Subject to subsection (3), if a record is in electronic form, a head shall give access to the record in electronic form if:

(a) it can be produced using the normal computer hardware and software and technical expertise of the local authority;

(b) producing it would not interfere unreasonably with the operations of the local authority; and

(c) it is reasonably practicable to do so.

(3) If a record is a microfilm, film, sound or video recording or machine-readable record, a head may give access to the record:

(a) by permitting the applicant to examine a transcript of the record;

(b) by providing the applicant with a copy of the transcript of the record; or

(c) in the case of a record produced for visual or aural reception, by permitting the applicant to view or hear the record or by providing the applicant with a copy of it.

[29] SPS chose to provide access to all video footage by providing the Applicant with the opportunity to view it pursuant to section 10(3)(c) of LA FOIP.

[30] The Applicant stated that SPS' approach was "illogical and unacceptable." They added:

I paid for these copies so I don't understand why I'm made to go out of my way to go and record a tv screen when it would be cheaper and easier for them to just send me a copy on DVD or whatever.

[31] Relying on my office's [Review Report 138-2015](#), SPS asserted that it was reasonable for it to provide access by asking the Applicant to attend at its office to view the record. It also informed my office that no fees were charged for accessing any of the records at issue here, other than the initial \$20.00 application fee.

[32] Section 10(3)(c) of LA FOIP gives SPS discretion to provide the Applicant with an opportunity to view the record as it has done in this case. SPS is not obligated under LA FOIP to provide the Applicant with a copy of the video recordings. Therefore, I find that SPS provided access to the record in an appropriate manner.

[33] In my office's [Review Report 163-2020](#), I stated that as our province moves towards using digital rather than paper records, I expect that public bodies will begin moving to providing

electronic access and my office encourages this. While section 10(3)(c) of LA FOIP permits local authorities to provide access as set out in that section, SPS should consider how providing electronic access will help reduce paper waste and costs and avoid the inconvenience for applicants who may not want to attend at its office to review the records.

5. Did SPS properly apply section 14(1)(c) of LA FOIP?

[34] SPS claimed that section 14(1)(c) of LA FOIP applied to records 4 (pages 4, 5 and 14), and the audio/video records 7 (segments (a), (b), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), (j) and (k)), and 8 (segments (e), (f), and (g)). SPS subsequently informed my office that the information withheld from record 4 on page 4 was withheld in error and it would be released to the Applicant. That information is no longer at issue here and I recommend that it be released to the Applicant.

[35] Section 14(1)(c) of LA FOIP provides:

14(1) A head may refuse to give access to a record, the release of which could:

...

(c) interfere with a lawful investigation or disclose information with respect to a lawful investigation;

[36] In order to determine if this exemption applies, my office applies the following two-part test:

1. Does the local authority's activity qualify as a "lawful investigation"?
2. Does one of the following exist?
 - a. Could release of the information interfere with a lawful investigation?
 - b. Could the release disclose information with respect to a lawful investigation?

(*Guide to LA FOIP*, Chapter 4, "Exemptions from the Right of Access", updated April 29, 2021 [*Guide to LA FOIP*, Ch. 4], pp. 52 - 53)

1. Does the local authority's activity qualify as a lawful investigation?

[37] A "lawful investigation" is an investigation that is authorized or required and permitted by law. When applying this exemption, the local authority should identify the legislation under which the investigation is occurring. The investigation can be concluded, active and ongoing or occurring in the future (*Guide to LA FOIP*, Ch. 4, p. 52).

[38] For this part of the test to be met it is only necessary for the local authority to demonstrate that the information in the record is information with respect to a lawful investigation. "With respect to" are words of the widest possible scope and this is probably the widest of any expression intended to convey some connection between two related subject matters (*Guide to LA FOIP*, Ch. 4, p. 53).

[39] SPS asserted that the records were created during lawful investigations into possible violations of *The Traffic Safety Act* (TSA) and the *Criminal Code* (CC). SPS' activities resulted in tickets being issued to the Applicant for violations. Based on a review of the records, I am satisfied that SPS' activities qualified as lawful investigations. It is clear on the face of the records that they were created by SPS' officers in connection with various lawful investigations authorized under TSA and CC. Therefore, I find that part one of the test has been met.

2. Does one of the following exist?

a. Could release of the information interfere with a lawful investigation?

b. Could the release disclose information with respect to a lawful investigation?

[40] To meet this part of the test, it is only necessary for the local authority to demonstrate that the withheld information is information with respect to a lawful investigation.

[41] SPS asserted the information withheld from record 4 (pages 5 and 14) was a note from a police officer about a court date and correspondence between SPS and Saskatoon City Hall Parking office on the same subject. Release of this information would disclose information

with respect to a lawful investigation under TSA and CC. Therefore, I find that the second part of the test has been met for this information.

[42] SPS asserted that the withheld portions of record 7, an ICC recording, was of police radio “chatter” about other calls for service in the city of Saskatoon, including a description of the allegations, location and “description of an individual whom dispatch was requesting police attend.” The information withheld from record 8 was portions of the audio recording of a conversation between an officer and a third party. SPS claimed that the withheld audio recordings were related to lawful investigations and potential investigations under TSA and CC.

[43] Having reviewed records 7 and 8 in full, I am satisfied that the release of the withheld audio portions identified in paragraph [34] above, would disclose information with respect to lawful investigations. I find that both parts of the test for the application of this exemption have been met for all records described in paragraph [34] above. Therefore, I find that SPS properly applied section 14(1)(c) of LA FOIP to the records and recommend that SPS continue to withhold them. Details of my recommendations are set out in Appendix A to this Report.

6. Did SPS properly apply section 14(1)(j) of LA FOIP?

[44] SPS applied section 14(1)(j) of LA FOIP to dispatch codes or “ten-codes” in record 1 (page 10) and various segments of record 7. Given my findings above, I need only consider the information withheld from records 1 (page 10) and 7 (segment (c)).

[45] Section 14(1)(j) of LA FOIP provides as follows:

14(1) A head may refuse to give access to a record, the release of which could:

...

(j) facilitate the commission of an offence or tend to impede the detection of an offence;

[46] Section 14(1)(j) of LA FOIP is a discretionary harm-based exemption. It permits refusal of access in situations where release of a record could facilitate the commission of an offence or impede the detection of one (*Guide to LA FOIP*, Ch. 4, p. 71).

[47] My office applies the following two-part test when deciding whether section 14(1)(j) of LA FOIP applies. However, only one of the questions needs to be answered in the affirmative for the exemption to apply. There may be circumstances where both questions apply and can be answered in the affirmative.

1. Could release of the record facilitate the commission of an offence?
2. Could release of the record tend to impede the detection of an offence?

(*Guide to LA FOIP*, Ch. 4, p. 72)

[48] With respect to this exemption, SPS asserted:

The use of ten-codes by law enforcement personnel is used as a means of communication that conveys a specific message without publicly identifying its true meaning. In Saskatchewan, each police service maintains an individual list of ten-codes only used by one specific police service, with the exception of standardized ten-codes such as 10-4 (understood/message received).

...

With the objective of officer and public safety, the SPS has utilized encryption methods in order to protect radio transmissions from being intercepted. However, should these encryption methods be breached, the ten-codes would maintain a level of security over the communications of members. The IPC has upheld the SPS' use of this subsection for this specific purpose in Review Reports 037-2018, 023-2019/-098- 2019 and 353-2019.

[49] My office has consistently found that release of “ten-codes” could facilitate the commission of an offence, including in my office’s [Review Report 353-2019](#), referred to by SPS in its submission. Based on my review of the information withheld from record 1 and the audio redacted from record 7 (segment (c)), I am satisfied that SPS has withheld “ten-codes” as described. Consistent with findings in previous reports, I find SPS properly applied section 14(1)(j) of LA FOIP to the ten-codes and recommend SPS continue to

withhold this information. Details of my recommendations are set out in Appendix A to this Report.

7. Did SPS properly apply section 28(1) of LA FOIP?

[50] SPS applied section 28(1) of LA FOIP to multiple records. In view of my findings above, I need only consider whether it properly applied it to the following records: 2 (pages 3 and 4), 3, 4 (pages 2 and 11), 5 (pages 2 and 5), 6 (pages 2 and 4), 7 (segments (l), (m), and (n)), 8 (segments (a), (b), (c), (d)), and 9 (segments (a) and (b)).

[51] Section 28(1) of LA FOIP is a mandatory exemption that protects the privacy of individuals whose personal information may be contained in records that are responsive to a request made by someone else. Section 28(1) of LA FOIP requires a local authority to have the consent of the individual whose personal information is in the record prior to disclosing it (*Guide to LA FOIP*, Ch. 4, p. 240).

[52] Section 28(1) of LA FOIP provides:

28(1) No local authority shall disclose personal information in its possession or under its control without the consent, given in the prescribed manner, of the individual to whom the information relates except in accordance with this section or section 29.

[53] In order for section 28(1) of LA FOIP to apply, the withheld information must qualify as third party “personal information.”

[54] Section 23(1) of LA FOIP defines “personal information” and provides some examples of the types of information that can be considered personal information. The list of examples of personal information is not exhaustive.

[55] The examples in sections 23(1)(a), (c), (d), (e), and (j) of LA FOIP are relevant to this review. These sections provide:

23(1) Subject to subsections (1.1) and (2), “personal information” means personal information about an identifiable individual that is recorded in any form, and includes:

(a) information that relates to the race, creed, religion, colour, sex, sexual orientation, family status or marital status, disability, age, nationality, ancestry or place of origin of the individual;

...

(c) information that relates to health care that has been received by the individual or to the health history of the individual;

(d) any identifying number, symbol or other particular assigned to the individual, other than the individual’s health services number as defined in The Health Information Protection Act;

(e) the home or business address, home or business telephone number or fingerprints of the individual;

...

(j) information that describes an individual’s finances, assets, liabilities, net worth, bank balance, financial history or activities or credit worthiness; or

[56] To qualify as personal information, the information must, 1) be about an identifiable individual, and 2) be personal in nature. As noted in my office’s [Review Report 069-2020](#), these terms are defined as follows:

“Identifiable individual” means that it must be reasonable to expect that an individual may be identified if the information were disclosed. The information must be reasonably capable of identifying particular individuals because it either directly identifies a person or enables an accurate inference to be made about their identity when combined with other available sources of information or because of the context of the information in the record.

“Personal in nature” means that the information reveals something personal about the individual.

[57] To support its claim that section 28(1) of LA FOIP applied, SPS asserted:

Portions of the Occurrence Reports were redacted as they contained personal information of individuals other than the Applicant such as names, dates of birth, sex, address, phone number, driver’s license numbers. This information qualifies as personal information pursuant to sections 23(1)(a), (d), (e), (k) of LA FOIP...

...

Portions of the ICC footage that were withheld also included personal information within sections (a)(b) and (k) of LA FOIP.

- [58] I note that the information withheld from records 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 was the names, sex, family status, marital status, name of motor vehicle owner, address and other contact details of the Applicant's family members. All this information would qualify as their personal information pursuant to sections 23(a), (e), and (j) of LA FOIP.
- [59] In the case of the individuals who are identified by their family status only in record 2 (pages 3 and 4), it is apparent from a review of that record that this information was provided to SPS by the Applicant. SPS confirmed with my office that this was accurate. From records 4, 5 and 6, SPS withheld an individual's name, motor vehicle model, contact details and date of birth. This is information that would have been within the knowledge of the Applicant.
- [60] In the past, I have said it is an absurd result to withhold information from an applicant who supplied the information (see for example my office's [Review Report 171-2019](#)) or who already has knowledge of the information (see for example my office's [Review Report 098-2020](#)). As the information described in paragraph [59] above was provided by the Applicant to SPS or was within the knowledge of the Applicant, it would be absurd to withhold it. I find that SPS did not properly apply section 28(1) of LA FOIP to this information and I recommend that SPS release it.
- [61] Information withheld from record 3 (page 3) was the sex of several unnamed individuals. Given the limited information about these individuals in the record, I find that it is not reasonable to expect that they may be identified if the record were disclosed. Nor would release of the information enable an accurate inference to be made about their identity when combined with other available sources of information. Therefore, I find that this information does not qualify as personal information. I find that SPS did not properly apply section 28(1) of LA FOIP to this information and I recommend that SPS release it.

[62] From Occurrence Reports described above as records 5 (page 5) and 6 (pages 2 and 4), SPS withheld information relating to an individual's driver's license number. This qualifies as personal information pursuant to section 23(1)(d) of LA FOIP. As the individual to whom this information relates did not consent to its release, I find that SPS properly applied section 28(1) of LA FOIP. I recommend that SPS continue to withhold this information pursuant to section 28(1) of LA FOIP.

[63] SPS redacted the images of individuals from record 7 (segments (e), (l), (m) and (n)). I accept that the identities of these individuals could be deciphered from their images, the location, date and time information noted in the video, particularly when combined with other available sources of information. Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that the individuals are identifiable, and the redacted video images qualify as the personal information of these individuals pursuant to section 23(1) of LA FOIP. I find that SPS properly applied section 28(1) of LA FOIP to this information and recommend that SPS continue to withhold it.

[64] Severed audio portions of records 8 (segments (a), (b), (c), (d) and 9 (segments (a) and (b)) contain information about the interactions between an identifiable individual and the police. The redacted audio also includes information about this individual's family status, health, and assets. I find that the redacted audio qualifies as the personal information of this other individual pursuant to sections 23(1)(a), (c), and (j) of LA FOIP. I find that SPS properly applied section 28(1) of LA FOIP to this information and I recommend that SPS continue to withhold it.

[65] Details of my recommendations regarding section 28(1) of LA FOIP are set out in Appendix A to this Report.

IV FINDINGS

[66] I find that I have jurisdiction to conduct this review.

[67] I find that SPS did not respond to the Applicant within the legislated timeline set out in section 7 of LA FOIP.

[68] I find that SPS conducted a reasonable search for records.

[69] I find that SPS provided access to the record in an appropriate manner.

[70] I find that SPS properly applied sections 14(1)(c) and (j) of LA FOIP.

[71] I find that SPS properly applied section 28(1) of LA FOIP to some records.

[72] I find that SPS did not properly apply section 28(1) of LA FOIP to some records.

V RECOMMENDATIONS

[73] I recommend that SPS review its policies, procedures, and training programs to ensure that it meets the legislated timelines under LA FOIP.

[74] I recommend that SPS take no further action with respect to its search for records and the manner of access.

[75] With respect to sections 14(1)(c), (j) and 28(1) of LA FOIP, I recommend SPS continue to withhold or release information or records as I have detailed in Appendix A to this Report.

Dated at Regina, in the Province of Saskatchewan, this 16th day of August, 2022.

Ronald J. Kruzeniski, Q.C.
Saskatchewan Information and Privacy
Commissioner

Appendix A

Record No.	Page No./Segment	Description	Exemption	Findings
1	Page 10	Occurrence Report (OR) 2010-89070	Section 14(1)(j) of LA FOIP	Withhold
2(a)	Page 3	OR 2012-40766	Section 28(1) of LA FOIP	Release
2(b)	Page 4	OR 2012-40766	Section 28(1) of LA FOIP	Release
3	Page 3	OR 2012-83966	Section 28(1) of LA FOIP	Release
4(a)	Page 2	OR 2013-109275	Section 28(1) of LA FOIP	Release
4(b)	Page 4	OR 2013-109275	SPS withdrew claim to 14(1)(c) of LA FOIP	Release
4(c)	Page 5	OR 2013-109275	Section 14(1)(c) of LA FOIP	Withhold
4(d)	Page 11	OR 2013-109275	Section 28(1) of LA FOIP	Release
4(d)	Page 14	OR 2013-109275	Section 14(1)(c) of LA FOIP	Withhold
5(a)	Page 2	OR 2019-110252	Section 28(1) of LA FOIP	Release
5(b)	Page 5	OR 2019-110252	Section 28(1) of LA FOIP	Release all but driver's license number
6(a)	Page 2	OR 2021-35538	Section 28(1) of LA FOIP	Release all but driver's license number
6(b)	Page 4	OR 2021-35538	Section 28(1) of LA FOIP	Release all but driver's license number
7 (a)	4:26-4:50	Video Footage ICC PC 483	Sections 28(1), 14(1)(c), (j) of LA FOIP	Withhold
7(b)	5:11-5:15	Video Footage ICC PC 483	Section 14(1)(c) of LA FOIP	Withhold
7(c)	6:39-6:40	Video Footage ICC PC 483	Section 14(1)(j) of LA FOIP	Withhold

7(d)	9:04-9:09	Video Footage ICC PC 483	Sections 28(1), 14(1)(c) of LA FOIP	Withhold
7(e)	11:37-11:45	Video Footage ICC PC 483	Sections 28(1), 14(1)(c) of LA FOIP	Withhold
7(f)	13:22-13:25	Video Footage ICC PC 483	Sections 28(1), 14(1)(c), (j) of LA FOIP	Withhold
7(g)	13:29-13:40	Video Footage ICC PC 483	Section 14(1)(c) of LA FOIP	Withhold
7(h)	14:14-14:15	Video Footage ICC PC 483	Sections 28(1), 14(1)(c) of LA FOIP	Withhold
7(i)	16:32-16:36	Video Footage ICC PC 483	Sections 28(1), 14(1)(c), (j) of LA FOIP	Withhold
7(j)	17:12-17:18	Video Footage ICC PC 483	Section 14(1)(c) of LA FOIP	Withhold
7(k)	17:57-18:07	Video Footage ICC PC 483	Sections 28(1), 14(1)(c) of LA FOIP	Withhold
7(l)	18:36-18:38	Video Footage ICC PC 483	Section 28(1) of LA FOIP	Withhold
7(m)	18:39-18:50	Video Footage ICC PC 483	Section 28(1) of LA FOIP	Withhold
7(n)	19:11-19:22	Video Footage ICC PC 483	Section 28(1) of LA FOIP	Withhold
8(a)	13:32-13:35	Video footage PC 211	Section 28(1) of LA FOIP	Withheld
8(b)	13:37-13:39	Video footage PC 211	Section 28(1) of LA FOIP	Withhold
8(c)	19:55-20:10	Video footage PC 211	Section 28(1) of LA FOIP	Withhold
8(d)	29:35-29:40	Video footage PC 211	Section 28(1) of LA FOIP	Withhold
8(e)	29:56-30:02	Video footage PC 211	Sections 28(1), 14(1)(c) of LA FOIP	Withhold
8(f)	30:06-30:08	Video footage PC 211	Sections 28(1), 14(1)(c) of LA FOIP	Withhold
8(g)	30:38-30:44	Video footage PC 211	Section 28(1), 14(1)(c) of LA FOIP	Withhold

9(a)	9:27-9:30	Video Footage PC 115	Section 28(1) of LA FOIP	Withhold
9(b)	9:31-9:35	Video Footage PC 115	Section 28(1) of LA FOIP	Withhold