



Police Services Board Meeting

Constable Colin McGregor Building
REPORT

DIRECTED TO:	<u>St. Thomas Police Services Board</u>
PREPARED BY:	<u>Chief M. Roskamp</u>
SUBJECT:	<u>Section 81 Chief's Investigation - OPP Prisoner Transport Escape; STPS Holding Facility (SIU Case 26-PCI-200)</u>
MEETING DATE:	<u>September 9, 2026</u>
REPORT #	<u>CHIEF-2026-29</u>
REPORT TITLE:	<u>Section 81 Chief's Investigation - OPP Prisoner Transport Escape; STPS Holding Facility (SIU Case 26-PCI-200)</u>

Recommendation:

THAT the Board receive this report pursuant to subsection 81(4) of the Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019 and subsection 8(2) of Ontario Regulation 90/24, and approve this de-identified report for publication on the Board's website in accordance with subsection 8(5) of Ontario Regulation 90/24.

Background:

Legislative Requirements:

Subsection 81(1) of the CSPA requires the Chief of Police, when the SIU Director causes an incident involving a member of the police service to be investigated, to investigate:

- (a) the member's conduct in relation to the incident;
- (b) the policing provided by the member in relation to the incident; and
- (c) the procedures established by the Chief of Police as they related to the incident.

Subsection 81(2) requires the investigation to occur promptly, subject to the statutory rules governing an active SIU investigation or related prosecution. Subsection 81(4) requires the Chief of Police to report on the investigation in accordance with regulations made by the Minister.

Ontario Regulation 90/24, section 8, establishes the applicable reporting and publication requirements: Subsection 8(2) requires the Chief's report to be given to the police service board.

Paragraph 8(3)1 requires the report, where the SIU investigation does not result in charges, to be given within 90 days after the SIU Director publishes a report or decides not to publish one, or as soon as possible thereafter if the 90-day period cannot be met.

Subsection 8(4) requires prompt notice to the Board, with reasons, if the report cannot be provided within the prescribed period.

Subsection 8(5) requires the Board to publish the report on the Internet no later than 30 days after receiving it.

Subsection 8(7) provides that publication is not required where the SIU Director decides under subsection 34(6) of the Special Investigations Unit Act, 2019 not to publish a report.

Subsection 8(8) prohibits the report from identifying any subject official, witness official, civilian witness or affected person, and protects information capable of identifying a person who reported a sexual assault.

Analysis:

On May 2, 2026, the St. Thomas Police Service facility was used for Weekend Video Bail Court, which was staffed and operated by the Ontario Provincial Police (OPP). Following the remand of an OPP prisoner, an STPS Special Constable assisted the OPP officer with the escort to the Elgin-Middlesex Detention Centre. After the OPP transport vehicle departed the STPS facility, the prisoner escaped from its rear prisoner compartment and was later re-arrested by the OPP. The serious injuries associated with the re-arrest led to SIU Case 26-PCI-200. The SIU Director issued a report on August 11, 2026, and no STPS member was alleged to have committed any crimes.

Summary of Findings:

The section 81 review examined the conduct of the STPS Officer in Charge and the assisting Special Constable, the policing they provided, and the relevant STPS procedures. The review included the SIU Director's report, member statements and notes, STPS custody video and communications records, occurrence and escort documentation, the Special Constable's appointment and job description, and the applicable STPS policies governing Weekend Video Bail Court, prisoner transportation, firearms in the cellblock, Special Constables and mutual assistance with the OPP.

The investigation found that the OPP retained care and control of its prisoner and was responsible for the transport vehicle. The STPS Officer in Charge acted appropriately in a supervisory role, including monitoring the bail-court process, authorizing assistance within the Special Constable's documented duties, identifying outstanding remand documentation before departure, and coordinating the STPS response once notified of the escape. The assisting Special Constable acted within the scope of the appointment and assigned duties. The evidence did not establish that either STPS member was responsible for restraining the prisoner, securing or operating the OPP vehicle, or otherwise contributed to the escape.

No misconduct or breach of STPS policy was substantiated. No deficiency was identified in the policing provided by the STPS members, and no gap or deficiency was identified in the applicable STPS policies or procedures. The evidence established that the escape arose from circumstances involving the OPP transport vehicle after it had departed the STPS facility and outside the operational control of the STPS members reviewed. No corrective action or policy amendment is recommended.

Financial Impacts:

Nil.

Conclusion:

The section 81 review is complete. The findings support the conclusion that the involved STPS members acted lawfully, appropriately and within their respective roles, and that STPS policies and procedures adequately addressed the circumstances under review. This report has been prepared in a de-identified form so that, following its receipt and approval by the Board, it may be published in accordance with Ontario Regulation 90/24.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. Roskamp', written in a cursive style.

Marc Roskamp M.O.M.
Chief of Police