



Office of the
Saskatchewan Information
and Privacy Commissioner

REVIEW REPORT 339-2025

Regina Police Service

August 20, 2026

Summary: The Applicant submitted an access to information request to the Regina Police Service (RPS) for a copy of a dispatch report.

RPS provided the Applicant with two pages, withheld in part pursuant to section 28(1) (third party personal information) and section 14(1)(j) (facilitate the commission of an offence or tend to impede the detection of an offence) of *The Local Authority Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (LA FOIP)*.

The Applicant requested that the Office of the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner review the exemptions applied by RPS.

The Commissioner found that RPS properly applied sections 28(1) and 14(1)(j) of *LA FOIP* to the records. The Commissioner recommended that RPS continue to withhold the redacted information.

I BACKGROUND

[1] On November 24, 2025, the Applicant submitted the following access to information request to the Regina Police Service (RPS):

Wellness check at 3AM on Nov. 13, 2022 to [Address]¹ Who called for this? Name please or names. Names of the two officers? Any other report filed by officers.

[2] On November 24, 2025, the Applicant paid the \$20.00 application fee.

¹ The use of square brackets in this Report preserves the personal information of parties involved in this access to information request.

- [3] On December 9, 2025, RPS provided a section 7 decision letter to the Applicant, informing that the responsive record was two pages and portions of one page was being withheld in part pursuant to the application of the discretionary exemption in section 14(1)(j) and an application of the mandatory exemption in section 28(1) of *The Local Authority Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (LA FOIP)*.² RPS provided the Applicant with an index of records and the names of the two RPS police officers.
- [4] On December 12, 2025, the Applicant requested a review of RPS' application of the exemptions by the Office of the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner (OIPC).
- [5] On May 22, 2026, OIPC notified RPS and the Applicant that this office would be undertaking a review of the exemptions as applied by RPS. OIPC requested that RPS provide a copy of the record at issue and an index of records by June 22, 2026. Both parties were invited to provide submissions to this office by July 21, 2026.
- [6] On June 23, 2026, RPS provided this office with a copy of the severed record at issue and an index. RPS provided a copy of the unsevered record on June 29, 2026.
- [7] On July 22, 2026, RPS provided OIPC with its submission.
- [8] The Applicant did not provide a submission.

II RECORDS AT ISSUE

- [9] One page of a two-page dispatch report was withheld in part pursuant to sections 28(1) and 14(1)(j) of *LA FOIP*.

² [*The Local Authority Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*](#), SS 1990-91, c. L-27.1, as amended.

III DISCUSSION OF THE ISSUES

1. Jurisdiction

[10] 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 28(1) of *LA FOIP*?

[11] RPS is relying on section 28(1) of *LA FOIP*, in part, to withhold three portions of the first page of the dispatch report.

[12] Section 28(1) of *LA FOIP* prohibits the disclosure of personal information of individuals unless the individual about whom the information pertains consents to its disclosure. Section 28(1) of *LA FOIP* provides:

Disclosure of personal information

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.

[13] Section 28(1) of *LA FOIP* is a mandatory exemption. Prior to a consideration of section 28(1) of *LA FOIP*, the first determination must be whether the information qualifies as “personal information” as defined by section 23(1) of *LA FOIP*. For information to be “personal information”, it must 1) be about an identifiable individual and 2) be personal in nature.³ Information is about an “identifiable individual” if:⁴

- the individual can be identified from the information (e.g., name, where they live); or

³ OIPC [Review Report 108-2025](#) at paragraph [33].

⁴ OIPC [Review Report 090-2025](#) at paragraph [27].

- the information, when combined with information otherwise available, could reasonably be expected to allow the individual to be identified.

[14] Section 23(1) of *LA FOIP* provides a list of what constitutes personal information but is not exhaustive. Sections 23(1)(a), (b), (f), and (h) 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;

(b) information that relates to the education or the criminal or employment history of the individual or information relating to financial transactions in which the individual has been involved.;

...

(f) the personal opinions or views of the individual except where they are about another individual;

...

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

[15] In the submission, RPS asserted that the severed information, when viewed collectively could reasonably identify the anonymous caller. The RPS made fulsome submissions, but reference to the details would reveal personal information.

[16] Although the withheld portions of the record do not include a name, we confirm that the withheld portions as described above constitute personal information pursuant to sections 23(1)(a), (b), (f) and (h) of *LA FOIP*. Based on the details provided, the identity of the caller could be revealed if released.

3. Did RPS properly apply section 14(1)(j) of *LA FOIP*?

[17] RPS is relying on section 14(1)(j) of *LA FOIP*, in part, to withhold two portions on the first page of the dispatch report.

[18] 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;

[19] Section 14(1)(j) of *LA FOIP* is a discretionary harm-based exemption. It permits refusal of access where release of a record could facilitate the commission of an offence or impede the detection of one. To determine if section 14(1)(j) of *LA FOIP* applies, only one of the following two questions needs to be answered in the affirmative, though both may apply:⁵

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

[20] In their submission, RPS stated:

...

- 900 Codes are Complaint Codes and are used by the RPS to provide quality service and ensure the best utilization of our resources.
- If the public was to become aware of our 900 codes, and the associated priorities for those calls, the knowledge could be used to facilitate the commission of an offence and impede the detection on an offence by diverting calls for service.
- RPS utilizes encryption for our radio transmissions to protect these 900 codes.

[21] Our office has previously found that section 14(1)(j) of *LA FOIP* applies to 900 codes and we adopt this position as it applies to the facts of this case such that the exemption was properly applied.⁶

⁵ OIPC [Review Report 078-2025](#) at paragraph [32].

⁶ OIPC [Review Report 176-2024](#) at paragraph [53].

IV FINDINGS

[22] OIPC has jurisdiction to undertake this review pursuant to PART VI of *LA FOIP*.

[23] RPS properly applied sections 28(1) and 14(1)(j) of *LA FOIP* to the redacted portions of the dispatch report.

V RECOMMENDATION

[24] I recommend that RPS continue to withhold the information redacted in the dispatch report, pursuant to the exemptions in sections 28(1) and 14(1)(j) of *LA FOIP*.

Dated at Regina, in the Province of Saskatchewan, this 20th day of August, 2026.

Grace Hession David
Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner