



Office of the
Saskatchewan Information
and Privacy Commissioner

REVIEW REPORT 090-2025

Regina Police Service

September 11, 2025

Summary:

The Applicant submitted an access to information request to the Regina Police Service (RPS) for copies of their personnel file, as well as notes, emails, documents and their personal information that RPS had on file. RPS provided partial access to records but it refused access to other records pursuant to sections 13(1)(a) (records from other governments), 16(1)(b) (consultations or deliberations), 16(1)(d) (plans that relate to the management of personnel), 21(c) (correspondence between legal counsel for the local authority and any other person) and 30(2) (evaluative or opinion material) of *The Local Authority Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (LA FOIP)*. RPS also redacted information it found to be non-responsive to the Applicant's access request. The Applicant requested a review from the Office of the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner (OIPC).

The Commissioner made several findings, including: 1) RPS did not meet its obligation pursuant to section 8 of *LA FOIP* (line-by-line review); 2) RPS did not properly apply section 30(2) of *LA FOIP*; 3) RPS properly applied section 28(1) of *LA FOIP* in all but one instance; and 4) that RPS properly applied sections 16(1)(b) and 21(c) of *LA FOIP* to some of the responsive records.

In terms of recommendations, RPS was supplied with a copy of the 286 pages it withheld in full pursuant to sections 16(1)(b), 21(c) and 30(2) of *LA FOIP* with the recommended redactions of OIPC. The Commissioner recommended that RPS redact their records accordingly and then release the records anew to the Applicant. The Commissioner made several other recommendations, including that RPS continue to withhold portions of the records where it applied section 28(1) of *LA FOIP* except in one instance. Where the Commissioner recommended release of records, it was recommended that RPS do so within 30 days of the issuance of this Report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I	BACKGROUND	4
II	RECORDS AT ISSUE.....	5
III	DISCUSSION OF THE ISSUES.....	7
	1. Ascertaining Jurisdiction	7
	2. Did RPS properly apply section 30(2) of <i>LA FOIP</i> ?.....	8
	3. Did RPS properly apply section 28(1) of <i>LA FOIP</i> ?.....	10
	4. Did RPS properly apply section 21(c) of <i>LA FOIP</i> ?.....	13
	<i>a. Records located in search of Manager, Integrated Health & Wellness' email account (5 pages)</i>	15
	<i>b. Records located in search of the first Human Resources Consultant's email account (10 pages)</i>	15
	<i>c. Records located in search of Manager, Police Information & Evidence Management's email account (6 pages)</i>	16
	<i>d. Records located in search of the second Human Resources Consultant's email account (4 pages)</i>	16
	<i>e. Letter drafted by RPS employees that was shared with RPS legal counsel (4 pages)</i>	16
	5. Did RPS properly apply section 16(1)(b) of <i>LA FOIP</i> ?.....	17
	<i>a. Records located in the search of the Manager, Integrated Health & Wellness' email account (87 pages)</i>	21
	<i>b. Records located in the search of a Human Resources Consultant's email account (40 pages)</i>	22
	<i>c. Records located in the search of the Manager Police Information & Evidence Management's email account (47 pages and 59 pages)</i>	24

<i>d. Records located in the search of the Access to Information Supervisor's email account (3 pages)</i>	24
<i>e. Records located in the search of another Human Resources Consultant's email account (5 pages)</i>	25
6. Did RPS properly withhold information as non-responsive to the Applicant's access request?	25
7. Did RPS properly process records by removing pages from the Original Copy?	28
<i>a. Duplicate Records</i>	28
<i>b. Confidentiality Statements and Blank Pages</i>	29
IV FINDINGS	30
V RECOMMENDATIONS	33

I BACKGROUND

[1] On February 11, 2025, the Regina Police Service (RPS) received, along with the Applicant's \$20.00 application fee, the following access to information request:

I am requesting copies of personnel file for previous employment. Date ranging between May 2024 to current date. Would like copies of any and all notes, emails, documents, and personal information that has been kept on file. Thank you.

[2] In a letter dated March 3, 2025, RPS advised the Applicant it was extending the 30-day response period by an additional 30 days pursuant to section 12(1)(a)(i) of *The Local Authority Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (LA FOIP)*.¹

[3] In its section 7 decision letter, dated April 11, 2025, RPS responded to the Applicant's access request. In the letter, RPS released the following material:

- *Tranche 1*: 325 pages were released to the Applicant, RPS termed this the "Final Copy". Redactions were applied throughout pursuant to sections 16(1)(b), 28(1) and 30(2) of *LA FOIP*.
- *Tranche 2*: 286 pages were withheld in full, pursuant to sections 13(1)(a), 16(1)(b), 16(1)(d), 21(c) and 30(2) of *LA FOIP*.

[4] On April 16, 2025, the Applicant requested a review by the Office of the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner (OIPC).

[5] On May 14, 2025, OIPC notified both RPS and the Applicant that it would be undertaking a review.

[6] *Tranche 1*: On June 17, 2025, RPS provided OIPC with two separate sets of documents. The first set was termed the "Original Copy". The Original Copy was 602 pages in length. RPS provided OIPC with this set of records fully unredacted. RPS also provided OIPC

¹ [*The Local Authority Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*](#), S.S. 1990-91, c. L-27.1, as amended.

with a second set of documents that was 325 pages in length. This tranche was termed the “Final Copy”. The Final Copy was provided to OIPC partially redacted in the form as supplied to the Applicant. RPS explained that the Final Copy was only 325 pages because it was an edited version of the Original Copy after the Original Copy had been reviewed and all duplicate pages, boilerplate confidentiality statements and blank pages had been removed.

- [7] *Tranche 2:* On July 15, 2025, RPS provided OIPC with the second tranche of records that it notified the Applicant of, but withheld in full. This second tranche of documents contained 286 pages and these documents were provided to this office in an unredacted state.
- [8] On August 12, 2025, OIPC received a submission from RPS. RPS indicated it did *not* consent to sharing its submission with the Applicant.
- [9] The RPS submission withdrew reliance on section 30(2) of *LA FOIP* as a basis to refuse access to portions of the records in the Final Copy. RPS confirmed that it was now relying on section 16(1)(b) of *LA FOIP* instead of section 30(2) of *LA FOIP* save in one instance. That one instance was an email that was withheld in its entirety.

II RECORDS AT ISSUE

- [10] As explained above, the section 7 decision from RPS involved the release of two separate installments of documents to the Applicant. The first installment involved the release of 325 pages of records to the Applicant with portions withheld pursuant to sections 16(1)(b), 28(1) and 30(2) of *LA FOIP*. When RPS provided OIPC with a copy of these records, it provided 602 pages of unredacted emails and the winnowed 325 pages with redactions for inspection by OIPC. RPS explained that it had removed records it deemed as duplicates, “blank pages”, or pages that featured only boilerplate confidentiality statements that appear on the bottom of email messages. Below is a description of these records and the exemptions as applied by RPS:

LA FOIP Exemption applied	Page numbers in “Original Copy”	Page numbers in “Final Copy” given to the Applicant
28(1)	1, 71, 87, 111, 117, 205, 228, 231 to 233, 236, 238, 239, 241, 256, 295, 297, 307, 315, 318, 342, 345, 347, 358, 359, 361, 363, 368, 400, 402, 403, 405, 406, 414, 415, 417, 419, 445, 570 and 574	1, 45, 56, 71, 75, 112, 126, 128 to 134, 141, 161, 162, 166, 167, 169, 184, 186, 187, 191 to 194, 196, 218 to 222, 227 to 230, 239, 300 and 304
30(2) ²	18 to 20, 90 and 94	13 to 15, 58 and 61
16(1)(b)	113, 114, 119, 120, 304 to 306 and 330	72, 73, 76, 77, 163 to 165 and 175
Non-responsive	1, 35, 48, 49, 56, 59, 139, 140, 336, 423, 509 and 510	1, 27, 35, 36, 41, 42, 91, 92, 180, 232, 275 and 276

- [11] The second part of the section 7 decision from RPS indicated that it was withholding 286 pages in full from the Applicant pursuant to sections 13(1)(a), 16(1)(b), 16(1)(d), 21(c) and 30(2) of *LA FOIP*. A description of these 286 pages is below:

LA FOIP Exemption Applied	Total Number of Pages that were Withheld in Full³
Records located in search of Manager, Integrated Health & Wellness’ email account	
16(1)(b)	87
21(c)	5
Records located in search of a Human Resources Consultant’s email account	
16(1)(b)	40
21(c)	10
30(2)	1
Records located in search of Manager, Police Information & Evidence Management’s email account	

² As noted in the background of this Report, RPS said it was no longer relying on section 30(2) of *LA FOIP* as its reason for refusing access. Instead, where it had cited section 30(2) of *LA FOIP*, it was now relying on section 16(1)(b) of *LA FOIP* as its reason for refusing access. Therefore, OIPC will only consider whether RPS properly section 16(1)(b) of *LA FOIP* to these pages.

³ The total number of pages refer to the total number of pages of each PDF that RPS provided to OIPC on July 15, 2025 for the purpose of this review.

16(1)(b) / non-responsive	47
16(1)(b) / non-responsive	59
Records located in search of another Human Resources Consultant's email account	
21(c)	6
Records located in search of Access to Information Supervisor's email account	
16(1)(b)	3
Records located in search of another Human Resources Consultant's email account	
16(1)(b)	5
21(c)	4

[12] RPS had initially refused to release the following records in full to the Applicant. However, in discussions with this office during the course of this review, RPS decided to release these records and, as such, they are no longer under review:

- 18 pages of the Applicant's own typed, diarized notes regarding the workplace. RPS had withheld these pages pursuant to section 16(1)(d) of *LA FOIP*.
- One page of the Applicant's RCMP fingerprint results. RPS had originally withheld this page pursuant to section 13(1)(a) of *LA FOIP*.

[13] Finally, OIPC noted that in addition to the 286 pages that RPS withheld in full from the Applicant, there was a copy of a four-page letter drafted by Human Resources employees and shared with RPS legal counsel. RPS refused access to the entirety of the draft of the letter pursuant to section 21(c) of *LA FOIP*.

III DISCUSSION OF THE ISSUES

1. Ascertaining Jurisdiction

[14] RPS qualifies as a "local authority" pursuant to section 2(1)(f)(viii.1) of *LA FOIP*. Therefore, OIPC has jurisdiction and is undertaking a review of this matter pursuant to PART VI of *LA FOIP*.

2. Did RPS properly apply section 30(2) of *LA FOIP*?

[15] RPS applied section 30(2) of *LA FOIP* to refuse the Applicant access to one page that contained an email dated May 27, 2024. The entire page was withheld in full. It was an email by a Human Resources Consultant to a RPS unit. Contained within the email were names, dates of birth, address and postal codes of job applicants, including the Applicant.

[16] Section 30(2) of *LA FOIP* provides:

30(2) A head may refuse to disclose to an individual personal information that is evaluative or opinion material compiled solely for the purpose of determining the individual's suitability, eligibility or qualifications for employment or for the awarding of contracts and other benefits by the local authority, where the information is provided explicitly or implicitly in confidence.

[17] In past reports, OIPC has used the following three-part test to determine if section 30(2) of *LA FOIP* was properly applied:⁴

1. Is the information personal information that is evaluative or opinion material?
2. Was the personal information compiled solely for one of the enumerated purposes?
3. Was the personal information provided explicitly or implicitly in confidence?

[18] In its submission, RPS provided the following in response to each part of the three-part test:

Yes. The request was made to our ["..."] section to ask for a evaluation on [Name of Applicant] and other persons either relating and or applying for positions with RPS.

...

⁴ See OIPC [Review Report 087-2024](#) at paragraph [19].

The information was compiled for [...] to do a check to ensure that [Name of Applicant] was the right fit and proper for employment with Regina Police Service.

...

The request was done in confidence and made to [...] for gathering information to determine if [Name of Applicant] was to be hired on at Regina Police Service.⁵

- [19] To meet the first part of the three-part test, the information must qualify as “personal information”. Relevant to this part of the review will be section 23(1)(h) of *LA FOIP*, which defines “personal information” as follows:

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:

...

(h) the views or opinions of another individual with respect to the individual;

- [20] “Evaluative” means to have assessed, appraised, to have found or to have stated the number of. “Opinion material” is a belief or assessment based on grounds short of proof; a view held as probable for example, a belief that a person would be a suitable employee, based on that person’s employment history. An opinion is subjective in nature and may or may not be based on facts.⁶

- [21] “Opinions” are views or judgements not necessarily based on fact or knowledge. “Views” are particular ways of regarding something, an attitude or opinion. The views or opinions expressed by an individual about another individual are the personal information of the individual they are about.⁷

⁵ The words in square brackets are OIPC’s amendments to protect identities.

⁶ See OIPC [Review Report 101-2024](#) at paragraph [125].

⁷ *Ibid*, at paragraph [124].

[22] Based on a review of the email, the information is not evaluative or opinion material. In the email, the Human Resources Consultant requested information from a specific unit of RPS. *The email is nothing more than a request for information.* The first part of the three-part test is not met. There is no need to consider the two remaining parts of the test. There will be a finding that RPS did not properly apply section 30(2) of *LA FOIP* to the one-page email dated May 27, 2024 by a Human Resources Consultant to a RPS unit. OIPC will consider whether portions of this email qualify as personal information in its analysis of section 28(1) of *LA FOIP*.

3. Did RPS properly apply section 28(1) of *LA FOIP*?

[23] RPS applied section 28(1) of *LA FOIP* to the following:

Page numbers in “Original Copy”	Page numbers in “Final Copy” given to the Applicant
1, 71, 87, 111, 117, 205, 228, 231 to 233, 236, 238, 239, 241, 256, 295, 297, 307, 315, 318, 342, 345, 347, 358, 359, 361, 363, 368, 400, 402, 403, 405, 406, 414, 415, 417, 419, 445, 570 and 574	1, 45, 56, 71, 75, 112, 126, 128, to 134, 141, 161, 162, 166, 167, 169, 184, 186, 187, 191 to 194, 196, 218 to 222, 227 to 230, 239, 300 and 304

[24] In addition to the pages listed in the table above, we must consider the one-page email dated May 27, 2024 by a Human Resources Consultant to a RPS unit. As noted, RPS only claimed the exemption as provided in section 30(2) of *LA FOIP* to that email. However, OIPC must consider whether section 28(1) of *LA FOIP* applies to portions of the email, because on its face it is clear there is personal information displayed within that email, which will be discussed at paragraph [31] of this Report.

[25] Section 28(1) of *LA FOIP* prohibits the disclosure of personal information of individuals other than the requesting individual unless the individual about whom the information pertains consents to its disclosure or if disclosure without consent is authorized by one of the enumerated exceptions in section 28(2) or section 29 of *LA FOIP*.

[26] 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.

[27] When analyzing the proper application of section 28(1) of *LA FOIP*, it must first be determined if the withheld information qualifies as personal information with respect to another individual pursuant to section 23(1) of *LA FOIP*. Section 23(1) of *LA FOIP* states that to qualify as personal information, the information must be about an identifiable individual and be personal in nature. Information is about an “identifiable individual” if:

- the individual can be identified from the information (e.g., name, where they live); or
- the information, when combined with information otherwise available, could reasonably be expected to allow the individual to be identified.

[28] Section 23(1) of *LA FOIP* provides a list of personal information but it is not exhaustive. Sections 23(1)(a), (e), (k)(i) and (ii) of *LA FOIP* will be relevant:

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;

...

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

...

(k) the name of the individual where:

(i) it appears with other personal information that relates to the individual; or

(ii) the disclosure of the name itself would reveal personal information about the individual.

- [29] In its submission, RPS said that the information it redacted pursuant to section 28(1) of *LA FOIP* in the pages of material listed in paragraph [23] of this Report is personal information that the Applicant had accessed in the course of their employment with RPS. RPS noted that the Applicant is no longer employed by RPS and thus they do “not have a right to retain, access, or request the return of this information.”
- [30] Based on a review, the portions of the records to which RPS applied section 28(1) of *LA FOIP* are names, dates of birth and/or phone numbers of individuals who were seeking a service provided by RPS. Such information does qualify as personal information as defined by sections 23(1)(a), (e), (k)(i) and (ii) of *LA FOIP*.⁸ RPS did not obtain the consent of these individuals to release their personal information pursuant to section 28(1) of *LA FOIP*. The only exception is the redacted portion at page 239 of the Original Copy (page 133 of the Final Copy) where the telephone number of a service organization was redacted. The telephone number is not personal in nature, and it is not with respect to an identifiable individual. There will be a finding that RPS properly applied section 28(1) of *LA FOIP* except for the redaction on page 239 of the Original Copy (page 133 of the Final Copy). There will be a recommendation that RPS continue to withhold the portions it redacted pursuant to section 28(1) of *LA FOIP* except for the redaction on page 239 of the Original Copy (page 133 of the Final Copy). There will be a recommendation that RPS release the telephone number on page 239 of the Original Copy (page 133 of the Final Copy) to the Applicant within 30 days of the issuance of this Report.
- [31] With regard to the one-page email dated May 27, 2024, to which RPS withheld in full pursuant to section 30(2) of *LA FOIP*, portions of the email contain names, dates of birth, addresses and postal codes of individuals other than the Applicant. Such information qualifies as personal information as defined by sections 23(1)(a), (e) and (k)(i) of *LA FOIP*. RPS did not obtain consent of these individuals to release their personal information pursuant to section 28(1) of *LA FOIP*. There will be a recommendation that RPS redact the personal information of the individuals (besides the Applicant) in the one-page email dated

⁸ See OIPC [Review Report 245-2022](#) at paragraph [68].

May 27, 2024 by a Human Resources Consultant to a RPS unit, and release the remainder of the record to the Applicant within 30 days of the issuance of this Report. OIPC has shared a copy of this page with RPS with the recommended redactions of OIPC.

4. Did RPS properly apply section 21(c) of *LA FOIP*?

[32] RPS applied section 21(c) of *LA FOIP* to the following records, in full:

Description	Total Number of Pages that were Withheld in Full
Records located in search of Manager, Integrated Health & Wellness' email account	5
Records located in search of a Human Resources Consultant's email account	10
Records located in search of Manager, Police Information & Evidence Management's email account	6
Records located in search of another Human Resources Consultant's email account	4

[33] RPS also applied section 21(c) of *LA FOIP* to a four-page letter drafted by Human Resources employees and shared with RPS legal counsel.

[34] Section 21(c) of *LA FOIP* provides:

21 A head may refuse to give access to a record that:

...

(c) contains correspondence between legal counsel for the local authority and any other person in relation to a matter involving the provision of advice or other services by legal counsel.

[35] OIPC uses the following two-part test to determine if section 21(c) of *LA FOIP* applies:⁹

⁹ See OIPC [Review Report 132-2020](#) at paragraph [197].

1. Is the record a correspondence between the local authority's legal counsel and any other person?
2. Does the correspondence relate to a matter that involves the provision of advice or other services by legal counsel?

[36] OIPC has defined the following relevant terms as follows:¹⁰

- “Correspondence” means letters sent or received. It is an interchange of written communication.
- “Any other person” was an intentional and inclusive phrase to capture just that – any other person. The government institution must make it sufficiently clear, as to what the nature of that other person's role in the correspondence was.
- “In relation to” has been found to have a similar meaning as “in respect of.” It was considered in *Nowegijick v. The Queen*.¹¹

[30] The words “in respect of” are in my opinion, words of the widest possible scope. They import such meanings as “in relation to”, “with reference to” or “in connection with”. The phrase “in respect of” is probably the widest of any expression intended to convey some connection between two relation subject- matters.

- “Legal advice” includes a legal opinion about a legal issue, and a recommended course of action, based on legal considerations, regarding a matter with legal implications.
- “Legal service” includes any law-related service performed by a person engaged by the local authority and who is licensed to practice law.

[37] For every instance where it applied section 21(c) of *LA FOIP*, RPS argued that the email conversation was between RPS Legal Counsel and an employee at RPS and that the emails involved recommendations on suggested course of actions and possible legal implications that could follow.

¹⁰ See OIPC [Review Report 024-2024](#) at paragraphs [20] and [26].

¹¹ [Nowegijick v. The Queen, \[1983\] 1 SCR 29](#) at page [39].

- [38] Below is an analysis of the pages to which RPS applied section 21(c) of *LA FOIP*. It should be noted for all these instances, email threads qualify as correspondence for the purposes of this provision,¹² and that the legal counsel involved is a member of the Law Society of Saskatchewan and is the same legal counsel for RPS throughout the exchanges.

a. Records located in search of Manager, Integrated Health & Wellness' email account (5 pages)

- [39] These five pages are an email thread where the Manager, Integrated Health & Wellness sought guidance from RPS legal counsel on a matter involving an individual who is not the Applicant. RPS legal counsel provided their guidance on the matter, which is a legal service. The two-part test is met. There will be a finding that RPS properly applied section 21(c) of *LA FOIP* to the body of the emails and the subject line in the header of these emails and a recommendation that it continue to withhold these portions of the record on this basis. However, it appears that RPS did not conduct a line-by-line review of the emails pursuant to section 8 of *LA FOIP*. A line-by-line review is a best practice and should always be adopted in the production of documents responding to access to information requests. The need for, and reason behind, this best practice will be discussed at paragraph [44] of this Report as it applies to these documents.

b. Records located in search of the first Human Resources Consultant's email account (10 pages)

- [40] These 10 pages are email threads where a Human Resources Consultant sought the opinion of RPS legal counsel on matters involving the Applicant (when the Applicant was an employee). RPS legal counsel provided their legal opinion in the email threads and so legal advice was conveyed. The two-part test is met. There will be a finding that RPS properly applied section 21(c) of *LA FOIP* to the bodies of these emails and a recommendation that RPS continue to withhold these portions of the record on this basis.

¹² See OIPC [Review Report 315-2023](#) at paragraph [124].

c. Records located in search of Manager, Police Information & Evidence Management's email account (6 pages)

- [41] These six pages are emails threads where the Manager, Police Information & Evidence Management is carbon copied where other RPS employees (such as a Human Resources Consultant) sought the opinion of RPS legal counsel on matters involving the Applicant. RPS' legal counsel provided their opinion in the email threads, which was a legal service. The two-part test is met. There will be a finding that RPS properly applied section 21(c) of *LA FOIP* to the bodies of the emails of these six pages and a recommendation that it continue to withhold these portions of the record on this basis.

d. Records located in search of the second Human Resources Consultant's email account (4 pages)

- [42] These four pages are email threads where a Human Resources Consultant is carbon copied on matters where other RPS employees (such as another Human Resources Consultant) sought the opinion of RPS legal counsel on issues involving the Applicant. RPS legal counsel provided a legal opinion in the email threads, which was a legal service. The two-part test is met. There will be a finding that RPS properly applied section 21(c) of *LA FOIP* to the bodies of the emails of these four pages and a recommendation that it continue to withhold these portions of the record on this basis.

e. Letter drafted by RPS employees that was shared with RPS legal counsel (4 pages)

- [43] RPS employees drafted a four-page letter. The Manager of Human Resources attached it to an email sent to RPS' legal counsel for editing and feedback.¹³ When considering this four-page letter in the context of the email, OIPC is satisfied that the draft of this letter is a part of correspondence between RPS employees and RPS legal counsel, where legal counsel provides an overall opinion, which is a legal service. The two-part test is met.

¹³ Copies of this email were located in the email accounts of the two Human Resources Consultants and the Manager, Police Information & Evidence Management. This email was considered in the analysis of the records located in each of these RPS employees' email accounts.

There will be a finding that RPS properly applied section 21(c) of *LA FOIP* to this four-page letter and a recommendation that it continue to withhold it on this basis.

- [44] OIPC notes that section 8 of *LA FOIP* requires local authorities to conduct a line-by-line analysis of a record, sever the portions of the record that may qualify for a mandatory or discretionary exemption and release the balance of the record. The Supreme Court of Canada has stated that access to information legislation establishes a presumption in favour of granting access in order to increase transparency, support an informed public and to ensure an open and democratic society.¹⁴ What that means is that public bodies such as RPS are to only sever information that is exempt from disclosure pursuant to *LA FOIP* and release the remainder of the record. In this case, RPS did not meet its obligation pursuant to section 8 of *LA FOIP*. Rather, it has withheld records in full when information such as headers and footers of the emails could be released without revealing the substance of the correspondence between RPS employees and RPS legal counsel. OIPC has said in past review reports involving RPS, including [Review Report 293-2023](#) at paragraph [16], [Review Report 132-2020](#) at paragraphs [227] and [228] and [Review Report 115-2020, 116-2020, 117-2020](#) at paragraphs [256] to [261], that RPS failed to conduct a line-by-line review as required by section 8 of *LA FOIP*. Nevertheless, RPS continues to apply exemptions in a blanket fashion. Therefore, there will be a recommendation that RPS conduct a line-by-line review of the records to which it withheld in full, redact only the information that would reveal the substance of the correspondence between RPS employees and RPS legal counsel and release the remainder of the records to the Applicant. In order to facilitate this process for RPS, OIPC has shared a copy of the RPS records withheld in full pursuant to section 21(c) of *LA FOIP* with a line-by-line redaction as recommended by this office.

5. Did RPS properly apply section 16(1)(b) of *LA FOIP*?

- [45] RPS applied section 16(1)(b) of *LA FOIP* to portions of the following pages:

¹⁴ [John Doe v. Ontario \(Finance\)](#), [2014] 2 SCR 3, 2014 SCC 36 (CanLII) at paragraph 41.

Page numbers in “Original Copy”	Page numbers in “Final Copy” given to the Applicant.
18 to 20, 90, 94, 113, 114, 119, 120, 304 to 306 and 330	13 to 15, 58, 61, 72, 73, 76, 77, 163 to 165 and 175

- [46] Further, RPS applied section 16(1)(b) of *LA FOIP* in full to some of the documents that were supplied to the Applicant in *Tranche 2*:

Description	Total Number of Pages that were Withheld in Full
Records located in search of Manager, Integrated Health & Wellness’ email account	87
Records located in search of a Human Resources Consultant’s email account	40
Records located in search of Manager, Police Information & Evidence Management’s email account	First set of records – 47 pages Second set of records – 59 pages
Records located in search of Access to Information Supervisor’s email account	3
Records located in search of another Human Resources Consultant’s email account	5

- [47] Section 16(1)(b) of *LA FOIP* provides:

16(1) Subject to subsection (2), a head may refuse to give access to a record that could reasonably be expected to disclose:

...

(b) consultations or deliberations involving officers or employees of the local authority;

- [48] OIPC uses the following two-part test to determine if a local authority has properly applied section 16(1)(b) of *LA FOIP*:¹⁵

1. Does the record contain consultations or deliberations?
2. Do the consultations or deliberations involve officers or employees of the local authority?

¹⁵ See OIPC [Review Report 313-2023](#) at paragraph [39].

[49] In the past, OIPC has used the following relevant definitions:¹⁶

- “Consultation” means the action of consulting or taking counsel together: deliberation, conference; a conference in which the parties consult and deliberate. A consultation can occur when the views of one or more officers or employees of a government institution are sought as to the appropriateness of a particular proposal or suggested action. It can include consultations about prospective future actions and outcomes in response to a developing situation. It can also include past courses of action. For example, where an employer is considering what to do with an employee in the future, what has been done in the past can be summarized and would qualify as part of the consultation or deliberation.
- “Deliberation” means the action of deliberating (to deliberate: to weigh in mind; to consider carefully with a view to a decision; to think over); careful consideration with a view to a decision; A deliberation can occur when there is a discussion or consideration of the reasons for or against an action. It can refer to discussions conducted with a view towards making a decision.
- “Involving” means including.
- “Officers or employees of a government institution”: “Employee of a government institution” means an individual employed by a government institution and includes an individual retained under a contract to perform services for the government institution.

[50] Recently, the Saskatchewan Court of King’s Bench determined that in the past, this office adopted too narrow of an interpretation of the terms “consultation” and “deliberation”. Gerecke J. said:¹⁷

[67] I accept that the concept of deliberation might suggest an intent to decide. Consultation appears to be a broader term, and need not have that objective, though the definition advanced by the Commissioner suggests that such an objective might be necessary. Consultation might reasonably occur at such an early stage of decision-making that it equates to information gathering to better inform proposal-development. If the Legislature intended to exclude discussions with persons that might not lead to decisions, it would have been a simple matter to include that notion in s.16. It did not do so.

¹⁶ See OIPC [Review Report 241-2024](#) at paragraph [25].

¹⁷ [Tarasoff v Saskatoon \(City\)](#), 2025 SKKB 41 at paragraph [67].

- [51] Still, it is established that this provision is not meant to protect the bare recitation of facts, without anything further.¹⁸ However, and in keeping with the inclusion of information gathering, any facts and background material in a record that informs later consultations or deliberations that are so intertwined with the consultation or deliberation should also be severed.¹⁹
- [52] As to how the information qualified as a consultation or deliberation, RPS described every instance in which it applied section 16(1)(b) of *LA FOIP* to a portion of the Original Copy (and the Final Copy) as a “candid conversation” to determine a course of action between RPS employees regarding the Applicant. The level of authority of RPS employees were noted as relevant for the purposes of what course of action would eventually be followed.
- [53] Pages 18 to 20 of the Original Copy (pages 13 to 15 of the Final Copy) are email exchanges between the Manager, Police Information & Evidence Management and a Human Resources Consultant regarding their views on information gathered through reference checks. There will be a finding that such information qualifies as consultations. Since the consultations involved two RPS employees, the two-part test for section 16(1)(b) of *LA FOIP* has been met.
- [54] Pages 113, 114, 119 and 120 of the Original Copy (pages 72, 73, 76 and 77 of Final Copy) contain an email exchange between two RPS employees. One RPS employee informs the other about an action they are going to take. The other RPS employee provides their opinion about the action. The email exchange shows the RPS employees are consulting and deliberating upon next steps. Since the consultations involved two RPS employees, then the two-part test for section 16(1)(b) of *LA FOIP* has been met.

¹⁸ See OIPC [Review Report 313-2023](#) at paragraph [43].

¹⁹ See OIPC [Review Report F-2013-007](#) at paragraphs [55] to [58] and OIPC [Review Report 202-2020](#) at paragraph [41].

- [55] Pages 304 to 306 of the Original Copy (pages 163 to 165 of the Final Copy) contain an email exchange between two RPS employees consulting and deliberating on next steps. Since the consultations involved two RPS employees, then the two-part test for section 16(1)(b) of *LA FOIP* has been met.
- [56] Page 330 of the Original Copy (page 175 of the Final Copy) is a summary of what happened during a work day, which provided background information that informed future consultations. Since the consultations involved two RPS employees, then the two-part test for section 16(1)(b) of *LA FOIP* has been met.
- [57] Pages 90 and 94 of the Original Copy (pages 58 and 61 of the Final Copy) are duplicates of each other. They contain an email exchange between two RPS employees. One RPS employee informed the other about what they had done. The other responds asking if they had completed an action. This email exchange appears to be a consultation and deliberation upon next steps in the future. Since the consultations involved two RPS employees, then the two-part test for section 16(1)(b) of *LA FOIP* has been met.
- [58] There will be a finding that RPS appropriately applied section 16(1)(b) of *LA FOIP* to pages 18 to 20, 90, 94, 113, 114, 119, 120, 304 to 306 and 330 of the Original Copy (pages 13 to 15, 58, 61, 72, 73, 76, 77, 163 to 165 and 175 of the Final Copy) and a recommendation that this information continue to be withheld on this basis.
- [59] With respect to the pages in *Tranche 2* that were withheld in full pursuant to section 16(1)(b) of *LA FOIP*, OIPC reviewed the pages in their unredacted form and made the following findings and recommendations:

a. Records located in the search of the Manager, Integrated Health & Wellness' email account (87 pages)

- Pages 3, 4, 25 to 85 are emails and documents forwarded by the Manager, Integrated Health & Wellness to legal counsel at RPS and an Inspector. The Manager requested that the legal counsel and the Inspector review the emails as part of an investigation into a complaint filed by the Applicant. Information within these pages qualifies as a consultation with a mind to “information gathering” to inform a position

with respect to a complaint. Since the consultations involved RPS employees, there will be a finding that RPS properly applied section 16(1)(b) of *LA FOIP* to pages 3, 4, 25 to 85 and a recommendation that this information continue to be withheld on this basis.

- However, the remainder of the 87 pages do not appear to be consultations or deliberations, and so there will be a finding that RPS did not properly apply section 16(1)(b) of *LA FOIP* to these pages and a recommendation that it release them to the Applicant within 30 days of the issuance of this Report. For example:
 - Pages 1 and 2 is a letter by RPS to the Regina Police Association announcing the outcome of a review of the complaint filed by the Applicant. Such information does not qualify as a consultation or deliberation.
 - Pages 5 to 12 and 21 to 24 are email exchanges between RPS and the Regina Police Association about the logistics of an investigation being conducted into a complaint filed by the Applicant as well as the setting up of meetings between RPS and the Regina Police Association. Such information is purely technical and logistical and, as such, does not qualify as a consultation or deliberation.
 - Pages 13 to 20 are RPS emails with RPS Information Technology (IT) department authorizing a request to conduct an email search. Such information does not qualify as a consultation or deliberation.

b. Records located in the search of a Human Resources Consultant's email account (40 pages)

- Pages 1 to 3 involve exchanges between the Human Resources Consultant to another RPS employee. The information exchanged between the two is background information that informed future consultations and deliberations regarding a hiring decision. Since the consultations and deliberations involving RPS employees, then there will be a finding that RPS properly applied section 16(1)(b) of *LA FOIP* and a recommendations that it continue to be withheld on this basis.
- Pages 4 to 6 – These pages are duplicates of pages 18 to 20 of the Original Copy (pages 13 to 15 of the Final Copy). RPS had already provided partial access to these pages. OIPC has already found that RPS properly applied section 16(1)(b) of *LA FOIP* to the redacted contents on pages 18 to 20 of the Original Copy (pages 13 to 15 of the Final Copy). There will be a finding that RPS properly applied section 16(1)(b) of *LA FOIP* to these pages and a recommendation and it continue to be withheld on this basis.

- Pages 13 to 15 – Email exchanges between a Human Resources Consultant and the Manager, Police Information & Evidence Management regarding a hiring decision. The exchanges include the consideration of options and the appropriateness of the options. Such information qualifies as a consultation. Since the consultation involved RPS employees, there will be a finding that RPS properly applied section 16(1)(b) of *LA FOIP* to pages 13 to 15 and a recommendation that it continue to be withheld on this basis.
- Pages 26 to 36 – Email exchanges between Manager, Police Information & Evidence Management, Human Resources Consultant and Deputy Chief. Employee performance and conduct is discussed, and possible options are formulated. Such information qualifies as a consultation. Since the consultation involved RPS employees, there will be a finding that RPS properly applied section 16(1)(b) of *LA FOIP* to pages 26 to 36 and a recommendation that it continue to be withheld on this basis.
- However, the remainder of these 40 pages do not qualify as consultations or deliberations. There will be a finding that RPS did not properly apply section 16(1)(b) of *LA FOIP* to these pages and a recommendation that it release these pages to the Applicant within 30 days of the issuance of this Report:
 - Pages 7 to 12 and 16 to 19 are email exchanges between RPS and the Applicant during the hiring process. Since the Applicant was party to these email exchanges prior to being an employee at the RPS, then the contents are clearly not consultations or deliberations.
 - Pages 20, 21, 24 and 25 all feature email threads where RPS employees are informing each other of actions they have taken and informing each other of a decision they made with respect to requests for leave and approvals. Such information does not qualify as consultations or deliberations.
 - Page 22 and 23 involve an email exchange between the Human Resources Consultant and the Manager, Police Information & Evidence Management and the Regina Police Association. They discuss a future request for leave on the part of the Applicant and how the leave will be reflected in terms of the human resources policies. Such information does not qualify as consultations or deliberations.
 - Pages 37 and 38 involve an email exchange between Manager, Police Information & Evidence Management and the Human Resources Consultant. The Manager gives an update to the Human Resources Consultant on what is being done that day. Such information does not qualify as consultations or deliberations.

- Pages 39 and 40 involve an email from Manager, Human Resources to Human Resources Consultant. In the email, the Manager attached a draft of a letter to the Human Resources Consultant – this letter does not feature in the email, it is simply an attached document that is not viewable. The substance of the email does not qualify as consultations or deliberations.²⁰

c. Records located in the search of the Manager Police Information & Evidence Management's email account (47 pages and 59 pages)

- The first set involves 47 pages and will be reviewed in the following section that discusses non-responsive documents.
- The second set of pages is 59 pages.
 - Pages 1 to 4 are emails between the Manager, Police Information & Evidence Management to a Human Resources Consultant about employee performance and conduct. These emails involve consultations with respect to employee performance/conduct and possible options. Such information qualifies as consultations. Since the consultations involved RPS employees, then there will be a finding that RPS properly applied section 16(1)(b) of *LA FOIP* to these first four pages and a recommendation that these pages continue to be withheld on this basis.
 - Pages 10 to 14 are emails between the Manager, Police Information & Evidence Management and a Human Resources Consultant. The Manager gives an update to the Human Resources Consultant on what is being done that day. Such information does not qualify as consultations or deliberations and so there will be a finding that RPS did not properly apply section 16(1)(b) of *FOIP* and a recommendation that it release it to the Applicant within 30 days of the issuance of this Report.
 - OIPC will consider pages 5 to 9, 15 to 59 in its analysis of the claim by RPS of these records being non-responsive in the next section of this Report.

d. Records located in the search of the Access to Information Supervisor's email account (3 pages)

²⁰ The letter was reviewed and is discussed in paragraph [43] of this report. This office found that RPS properly applied the exemption contained in section 21(c) of *LA FOIP* to that letter.

- These three pages are email exchanges between the Access to Information Supervisor and a Sergeant. It appears that the Supervisor sought information on behalf of the Applicant's personal matter and the Applicant's request for information. The contents of the email exchange do not qualify as consultations or deliberations and so there will be a finding that RPS did not properly apply section 16(1)(b) of *LA FOIP* to these pages and a recommendation it release it to the Applicant within 30 days of the issuance of this Report.

e. Records located in the search of another Human Resources Consultant's email account (5 pages)

- Emails exchanges between Human Resources Consultants and Deputy Chief. Employee performance and employee conduct is discussed along with possible options. These exchanges include consultations and deliberations. Since the consultations involved RPS employees, then there will be a finding RPS properly applied section 16(1)(b) of *LA FOIP* to these five pages and a recommendation that it continue to be withheld on this basis.

[60] Once again, this office recommends that RPS conduct a line-by-line review of the records in *Tranche 2* pursuant to section 8 of *LA FOIP*. RPS should only be redacting information that reveals the substance of the information that qualifies as consultations. Other information, such as information within headers and footers, *which do not reveal the substance of the consultations* should be released to the Applicant. OIPC has furnished RPS with a version of the recommended line-by-line redactions of the disclosable records in this section.

6. Did RPS properly withhold information as non-responsive to the Applicant's access request?

[61] RPS claimed that portions of pages 1, 35, 48, 49, 56, 59, 139, 140, 336, 423, 509 and 510 of the Original Copy (pages 1, 27, 35, 36, 41, 42, 91, 92, 180, 232, 275 and 276 of the Final Copy) were non-responsive to the Applicant's access request.

[62] RPS noted that two sets of records located in the search of the Manager, Police Information & Evidence Management's email account were non-responsive. Earlier in this Report, OIPC described the first set of records as 47 pages and the second set at 59 pages. This

office has already found that the exemption within section 16(1)(b) of *LA FOIP* properly applies to pages 1 to 4 of the 59 page set of documents. OIPC now considers whether pages 5 to 9 and 15 to 59 are properly claimed by RPS to be non-responsive.

[63] When a record is “responsive” to an access request, it means that the record contains relevant information. It follows that any information or records that do not reasonably relate to the access request will be considered “not responsive”.²¹

[64] The access request itself sets out the boundaries of relevancy and circumscribes the records or information that will ultimately be identified as being responsive. The local authority may treat portions of a record as not responsive if they are clearly separate and distinct and entirely unrelated to the access request.²²

[65] In reviewing the portions of the Original Copy (and Final Copy) of the record that RPS marked as non-responsive, OIPC must consider whether those particular portions contain the Applicant’s personal information or provide context to the remainder of the record that is the Applicant’s personal information. This is based on Order F2018-75 where the Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner of Alberta explains what is considered non-responsive:²³

[para 56] Information must be considered in the context of the record as a whole, in determining whether it is separate and distinct from the remainder of the record. In the case of a personal information request like the Applicant’s, in order to withhold portions of a record as non-responsive, the Public Body must consider whether that portion contains the Applicant’s personal information or whether that portion provides context to the remainder of the record that is the Applicant’s personal information.

[para 57] An example of ‘separate and distinct’ might be distinct emails in an email chain. Another example relates to police officers’ notebooks, which often contain notes on unrelated incidents on a single page. In response to an access

²¹ See OIPC [Review Report 290-2023](#) at paragraph [50].

²² *Ibid* at paragraph [51].

²³ AB OIPC [Order F2018-75](#) at [para 56] to [para 57].

request for police records relating to one incident, the part of the notebook page that relates to a different incident might be non-responsive. Another example is where a personal note is added to a work email, such as a note referencing a medical absence, holiday or so on. Where that personal note does not have any relation to the remainder of the email or to the access request, it might be non-responsive.

- [66] The portions of pages 1, 35, 48, 49, 56, 59, 139, 140, 336, 423, 509 and 510 of the Original Copy (pages 1, 27, 35, 36, 41, 42, 91, 92, 180, 232, 275 and 276 of the Final Copy) to which RPS marked as non-responsive, do not contain information that is the Applicant's personal information nor does it provide context to the remainder of the record that is the Applicant's personal information. For example, portions marked as non-responsive on page 1 of the Original Copy (page 1 of the Final Copy) contain an explanation of a matter that is completely unrelated to the access request – in essence it involves nothing more than an RPS employee's personal information unconnected to this matter. Other redacted portions in the Original Copy and Final Copy appear to be collegial banter between RPS employees. This banter is completely unrelated to the access request or the Applicant. There will be a finding that the portions of pages 1, 35, 48, 49, 56, 59, 139, 140, 336, 423, 509 and 510 of the Original Copy (pages 1, 27, 35, 36, 41, 42, 91, 92, 180, 232, 275 and 276 of the Final Copy) are non-responsive to the Applicant's access request and a recommendation that RPS continue to withhold these portions.
- [67] Next, a review of the 47-page set of records as well as pages 5 to 9 and 15 to 59 of the 59-page set of records that were located in the search of the Manager, Police Information & Evidence Management's email account, reveals emails and a lengthy attachment sent by a Staff Sergeant to other RPS employees about matters that are completely unrelated to the subject matter of the access request and the Applicant. The Applicant, while an employee of the RPS, was mistakenly included as a recipient of the email. Such information is clearly non-responsive to the Applicant's access request. There will be a finding that the 47-page set of records and pages 5 to 9 and 15 to 59 of the second set of records that were located in the search of the Manager, Police Information & Evidence Management's email account are indeed non-responsive and a recommendation that RPS continue to withhold it.

7. Did RPS properly process records by removing pages from the Original Copy?

[68] As outlined earlier in this report, RPS explained that it removed pages from the Original Copy that it deemed as duplicates, “blank pages” or pages that featured boilerplate confidentiality statements that appear at the bottom of email messages in coming to the document it presented to the Applicant termed the Final Copy.

[69] In the course of this review, OIPC learned that the Applicant was never informed of the fact that the Original Copy had been culled down from 602 pages to the 325 pages that made up the Final Copy. Best practice involves the local authority providing an explanation to the Applicant when this type of exercise is engaged. As such, this office ventures forth with an explanation of how the records were winnowed.

a. Duplicate Records

[70] In *Kasprick v. Saskatchewan Power Corporation*, Davis J. found there was very little value in a public body disclosing duplicate copies of records that were already in the possession of an Applicant.²⁴ Duplicates are considered to be records that are “identical in all material respects”:

[65] Where a record is a duplicate, or contains duplicative pages, I see little value in ordering that it be reproduced and disclosed. This creates mindless busy work for a taxpayer-funded employee without moving the needle toward promoting transparency. I do not think it matters that the applicant is not paying. If he is not paying, that just means everyone else is.

[66] Nonetheless, when a record-holder declines to release a duplicate record, it must provide an explanation indicating of what document the record is a duplicate. Moreover, the record-holder must only decline to disclose duplicates when the documents are actually identical in all material respects. In the appendix to this decision, I will indicate which documents are duplicates of records that should be released.

[Emphasis added]

²⁴ [*Kasprick v Saskatchewan Power Corporation*, 2025 SKKB 139](#) (August 15, 2025) Justice A. Davis

[71] Pages 58, 61 and 64 are all duplicate copies of the same record in the Original Copy. They are all identical in all material respects. Instead of providing three copies of this page, RPS provided one page, page 40, of the Final Copy to the Applicant. Another example is pages 168 and 170 of the Original Copy. They are both identical in all material respects. RPS provided one copy of the record – page 102 of the Final Copy - to the Applicant. In line with the *Kasprick* ruling there is little value in this office recommending that RPS provide duplicate copies of records that RPS has already provided to the Applicant but the Applicant should have been told of the filtering that had occurred. There will be a recommendation that, going forward, if RPS sees fit to remove duplicate copies of records, that it provides an explanation to the applicant of which documents were removed and why.

b. Confidentiality Statements and Blank Pages

[72] Boilerplate RPS confidentiality statements appear on pages 25, 26, 51, 54, 57, 63, 66, 70, 73, 76, 80, 93, 97, 101, 108, 116, 122, 124, 126, 136, 137, 141, 144, 145, 148, 149, 156, 158, 161, 173, 180, 185, 194, 199, 204, 214, 229, 237, 242, 244, 251, 266, 271, 277, 281, 283, 290, 292, 303, 308, 309, 313, 314, 317, 319, 325, 327, 355, 360, 369, 374, 396, 401, 404, 407, 416, 420, 422, 427, 432, 443, 446, 450, 463, 466, 474, 485 and 511 of the Original Copy. RPS properly removed all these pages. The Applicant did not receive these pages in the Final Copy.

[73] Further, pages featuring an email signature and a boilerplate RPS confidentiality statement appear on pages 2, 6, 14, 39, 43, 45, 106, 167, 169, 171, 268, 288, 296, 362, 364, 435, 438, 454, 470, 508 and 602 of the Original Copy. RPS properly removed all these pages. The Applicant did not receive a copy of these pages in the Final Copy.

[74] Blank pages occurred on pages 41, 46, 60, 68, 82, 86, 99, 110, 112, 118, 151, 153, 175, 190, 207, 209, 212, 218, 220, 222, 224, 226, 234, 240, 246, 248, 253, 255, 257, 259, 261, 273, 275, 279, 286, 294, 298, 323, 329, 337, 341, 343, 346, 348, 352, 376, 398, 409, 411, 481, 514 and 595 of the Original Copy. These pages are mostly blank but top of the pages feature the subject line of an email that was on the page before while the footer contains

the RPS webmail uniform resource locator (URL). RPS properly removed all these pages. The Applicant did not receive a copy of these pages in the Final Copy.

[75] As mentioned earlier, RPS was correct to winnow the file in this way. However, RPS did not communicate with the Applicant regarding its removal of these pages from the responsive record. Section 5.1(1) of *LA FOIP* imposes a duty to assist Applicants, including responding to access requests “openly, accurately and completely”. Removing pages to ensure a wholly responsive record without communicating with the Applicant violates the spirit of section 5.1(1) of *LA FOIP*. Transparent communication with an Applicant ensures trust in the access process. After all, RPS gathered 602 pages of responsive records in the Original Copy but ultimately released 325 pages in the Final Copy. Any Applicant would be alarmed and left wondering why so many pages were removed with no explanation. Going forward RPS must communicate the reason for removing pages to an Applicant to facilitate trust and transparency with the access request process and there will be a recommendation to follow in this respect.

[76] While it is true that the removal of duplicate/blank pages lowers the cost of photocopying for an Applicant, some applicants may wish to view the responsive records as a whole even if that means they have to pay a higher fee. The point is, a local authority cannot assume the wishes of an applicant. To observe the duty to assist as set out in section 5.1(1) of *LA FOIP*, RPS should contact the applicant prior to removing pages so that the reason for the removal may be conveyed and instructions taken as to whether this is the course of action wished by the applicant. There will be a recommendation that RPS, going forward, will contact applicants prior to removing records that are duplicates, pages that feature confidentiality statements, or that are mostly blank.

IV FINDINGS

[77] OIPC has jurisdiction to conduct this review.

[78] RPS did not properly apply section 30(2) of *LA FOIP* to the one-page email dated May 27, 2024 by the Human Resources Consultant to a RPS unit. Section 28(1) of *FOIP* applies to portions of this email, as outlined at paragraph [31] of this Report.

[79] RPS properly applied section 28(1) of *LA FOIP* to the portions of the pages of the record outlined at paragraph [23] of this Report, except for its redaction on page 239 of the Original Copy (page 133 of the Final Copy).

[80] Regarding the records that RPS withheld in full pursuant to section 21(c) of *LA FOIP*:

Description	Total Number of Pages that were Withheld in Full	OIPC Findings
Records located in search of Manager, Integrated Health & Wellness' email account	5	RPS properly applied section 21(c) of <i>LA FOIP</i> to the body of the email as well as the subject line in the header of the emails.
Records located in search of a Human Resources Consultant's email account	10	RPS properly applied section 21(c) of <i>LA FOIP</i> to the body of the email.
Records located in search of Manager, Police Information & Evidence Management's email account	6	RPS properly applied section 21(c) of <i>LA FOIP</i> to the body of the email.
Records located in search of another Human Resources Consultant's email account	4	RPS properly applied section 21(c) of <i>LA FOIP</i> to the body of the email.

[81] RPS properly applied section 21(c) of *LA FOIP* to the four-page letter that was drafted by Human Resources employees and sent to RPS legal counsel for editing and feedback.

[82] RPS did not meet its obligation pursuant to section 8 of *LA FOIP*.

[83] RPS appropriately applied section 16(1)(b) of *LA FOIP* to pages 18 to 20, 90, 94, 113, 114, 119, 120, 304 to 306 and 330 of the Original Copy (pages 13 to 15, 58, 61, 72, 73, 76, 77, 163 to 165 and 175 of the Final Copy).

[84] Regarding records that RPS withheld in full pursuant to section 16(1)(b) of *LA FOIP*:

Description	Total Number of Pages that were Withheld in Full	OIPC Findings
Records located in search of Manager, Integrated Health & Wellness' email account	87	RPS properly applied section 16(1)(b) of <i>LA FOIP</i> to pages 3, 4, 25 to 85. RPS did not properly apply section 16(1)(b) of <i>LA FOIP</i> to pages 1, 2, 5 to 24, 86 and 87.
Records located in search of a Human Resources Consultant's email account	40	RPS properly applied section 16(1)(b) of <i>LA FOIP</i> to pages 4 to 6, 13 to 15 and 26 to 36. RPS did not properly apply section 16(1)(b) of <i>LA FOIP</i> to pages 1 to 3, 7 to 12, 16 to 25 and 37 to 40.
First Set of Records located in search of Manager, Police Information & Evidence Management's email account	47	These 47 pages are non-responsive.
Second Set of Records located in search of Manager, Police Information & Evidence Management's email account	59	RPS properly applied section 16(1)(b) of <i>LA FOIP</i> to pages 1 to 4. RPS did not properly apply section 16(1)(b) of <i>LA FOIP</i> to pages 10 to 14. Pages 5 to 9 and 15 to 59 are non-responsive.
Records located in search of Access to Information Supervisor's email account	3	RPS did not properly apply section 16(1)(b) of <i>LA FOIP</i> to these three pages.
Records located in search of another Human Resources Consultant's email account	5	RPS properly applied section 16(1)(b) of <i>LA FOIP</i> these five pages.

- [85] Portions of pages 1, 35, 48, 49, 56, 59, 139, 140, 336, 423, 509 and 510 of the Original Copy (pages 1, 27, 35, 36, 41, 42, 91, 92, 180, 232, 275 and 276 of the Final Copy) are non-responsive to the Applicant's access request.

V RECOMMENDATIONS

- [86] Regarding the one-page email dated May 27, 2024 by the Human Resources Consultant to a RPS unit that RPS withheld in full pursuant to section 30(2) of *LA FOIP*, I recommend that RPS redact the names, dates of birth, addresses and postal codes of the job applicants (except for the Applicant) pursuant to section 28(1) of *LA FOIP* and release the remainder. OIPC has supplied a copy of the record to RPS with the recommended redactions of OIPC.
- [87] I recommend that RPS continue to withhold the portions of it redacted on the pages of the record as outlined at paragraph [23] of this Report pursuant to section 28(1) of *LA FOIP* except for the redaction on page 239 of the Original Copy (page 133 of the Final Copy).
- [88] I recommend that RPS release the telephone number that appears on page 239 of the Original Copy (page 133 of the Final Copy).
- [89] OIPC has shared a copy of the records RPS properly withheld in full pursuant to section 21(c) of *LA FOIP* with a line-by-line review conducted by this office. I recommend that RPS review and incorporate the line-by-line redactions and then release the records to the Applicant once again along with the proper exemptions in section 21(c) of *LA FOIP* as noted in paragraphs [80] and [81] of this Report.
- [90] I recommend that RPS continue to withhold the portions it redacted pursuant to section 16(1)(b) of *LA FOIP* to pages 18 to 20, 90, 94, 113, 114, 119, 120, 304 to 306 and 330 of the Original Copy (pages 13 to 15, 58, 61, 72, 73, 76, 77, 163 to 165 and 175 of the Final Copy).
- [91] OIPC has shared a copy of the records RPS withheld in full pursuant to section 16(1)(b) of *LA FOIP* with a line-by-line review as conducted by this office. I recommend that RPS

review and incorporate the line-by-line redactions and then release the records it properly withheld in full pursuant to section 16(1)(b) of *LA FOIP* as OIPC has recommended and then release the remainder of the records to the Applicant and as outlined in paragraphs [83] and [84] of this Report.

- [92] I recommend that RPS continue to withhold the portions of pages 1, 35, 48, 49, 56, 59, 139, 140, 336, 423, 509 and 510 of the Original Copy (pages 1, 27, 35, 36, 41, 42, 91, 92, 180, 232, 275 and 276 of the Final Copy) are non-responsive to the Applicant's access request.
- [93] I recommend that RPS continue to withhold the 47-page set of records and pages 5 to 9 and 15 to 59 of the second set of records that were located in its search of the Manager, Police Information & Evidence Management's email account as non-responsive.
- [94] I recommend that, going forward, if RPS sees fit to remove duplicate copies of records, that it provides an explanation to the applicant of which documents were removed and why.
- [95] I recommend that RPS, going forward, will contact applicants prior to removing records that are duplicates, pages that feature confidentiality statements, or that are mostly blank.
- [96] Where I recommend that RPS release records (*Tranche 1* and *Tranche 2*), I recommend that RPS do so within 30 days of the issuance of this Report.

Dated at Regina, in the Province of Saskatchewan, this 11th day of September, 2025.

Grace Hession David
Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner