

ASIRT DECISION

**IN THE MATTER OF DISTRIBUTING INTIMATE IMAGE
ALLEGATIONS AGAINST AN RCMP OFFICER IN
FEBRUARY AND MARCH 2025**

Executive Director: Matthew Block

File No.: 2025-0012(N)

Date of Release: Sept. 9, 2026

Introduction

On March 26, 2025, pursuant to s. 46.1 of the *Police Act*, the Director of Law Enforcement directed the Alberta Serious Incident Response Team (ASIRT) to investigate allegations that a Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) officer had distributed intimate images of the affected person (AP) without consent. The investigation began prior to the Police Review Commission's establishment on Dec. 1, 2025, and associated changes to the *Police Act*.

ASIRT designated one subject officer (SO) and provided him with notice. ASIRT's investigation is now complete.

ASIRT's Investigation

ASIRT's investigation was comprehensive and thorough, conducted using current investigative protocols, and in accordance with the principles of major case management.

ASIRT investigators interviewed the AP on two occasions and reviewed the statement she previously provided to the Kelowna RCMP. They also obtained judicial authorization to search the AP's cellphone, which resulted in the recovery of messages exchanged between the AP and the SO.

ASIRT investigators interviewed the SO's wife. They also obtained the reports and notes of two officers from the SO's RCMP detachment and three Kelowna RCMP officers who had conducted the initial interview with the AP and undertaken preliminary investigative steps.

As the subject of a criminal investigation, the SO was entitled to exercise his right to silence and was under no obligation to provide a statement to ASIRT. In this case, the SO voluntarily provided a written statement to ASIRT investigators, which included copies of messages exchanged with the AP. He subsequently provided a supplementary written response addressing follow-up questions posed by investigators.

ASIRT investigators also conducted online searches for relevant images, completed audits of police database activity, and reviewed applicable RCMP policies governing the authorized use of the Canadian Police Information Centre (CPIC) and Police Reporting and Occurrence System (PROS) databases.

Circumstances Surrounding the Incident

The AP and the SO met through a members-only dating website in January 2023 and subsequently developed an online relationship, communicating through various messaging applications. During their interactions, the SO paid the AP for sexually explicit photos and videos. He also expressed an interest in involving the AP in a sexual encounter with himself and his wife. On Feb. 24, 2025, at the AP's request, the SO sent her an intimate photo of his wife and an intimate video of himself. The SO's wife confirmed that she was aware of, and consented to, sharing her image.

On Feb. 26 and 27, 2025, the SO and the AP exchanged messages in which the SO expressed frustration that the AP had not yet agreed to meet in person. During those exchanges, the SO threatened to post the AP's intimate images and videos on a publicly-accessible pornography website, sell them, or send them to the AP's mother through Facebook. However, the messages did not progress to the point where the SO sought to induce the AP to take any action in exchange for his refraining from carrying out those threats. The AP responded by cautioning the SO that such conduct would be illegal.

After several weeks without communication, the SO contacted the AP on March 25, 2025, and sent her a video compilation containing photos and videos that she had previously provided to him. The AP became upset and advised the SO that she intended to report him to police for distributing intimate images without her consent. The SO denied having distributed the images to anyone else and stated that he had merely sent the AP a compilation of content she had previously created and for which she had been paid. He further advised the AP that any allegation that he had distributed her intimate images would be false and could result in her being charged with mischief. The AP made a complaint to the Kelowna RCMP that same day.

Records confirmed that the SO queried the AP's name in PROS on March 25, April 3 and April 25, 2025. There is no evidence that the SO acted upon any information obtained through those queries or disclosed any such information to another person.

The SO and the AP never met in person. The AP was unaware that the SO was a police officer until she was notified by ASIRT of its involvement in the matter.

In a written statement provided to ASIRT investigators, the SO denied publicly distributing any intimate images of the AP. He acknowledged conducting searches of the AP through a police database, the Police Information Portal, and stated that he did so to confirm her identity and determine whether she had filed a complaint against him.

ASIRT obtained and executed a search warrant for the AP's cellphone. Examination of the video compilation sent by the SO determined that the opening image was a screenshot of the AP's profile picture from the members-only dating website through which the parties had met and that the remaining photographs and videos were content previously provided by the AP to the SO. Investigators also conducted reverse image and facial recognition searches of the Internet, and specifically the publicly accessible pornography website previously referenced by the SO, to determine if the video had been publicly posted. Those inquiries yielded no evidence that the video compilation had been posted online or that any intimate images or videos had been sent to the AP's mother.

Analysis

Parliament recently amended the intimate images sections of the *Criminal Code* and, as of July 19, 2026, threatening to publish an intimate image without consent is now an offence. At the time of this incident, however, it was not an offence. The sections at that time required that the intimate images be distributed.

There is insufficient evidence to substantiate the original allegations that the SO distributed intimate images of the AP. However, the investigation determined, and the SO acknowledged, that he accessed police databases to query the AP's name for personal reasons unrelated to any legitimate law enforcement purpose or the authorized scope of his work duties.

Access or using a computer system outside of its intended purpose may constitute the criminal offence of unauthorized use of a computer system. Here, the SO searched the Police Information Portal or PROS to access information about the AP in circumstances with no lawful reason. A police officer who uses privileges associated with their position, including access to restricted police databases, for personal purposes may also engage in conduct amounting to a breach of trust.

ACPS Opinion

As a result of ASIRT's investigation, there were reasonable grounds to believe that the criminal offences of unauthorized use of computer and breach of trust were committed by the SO. Accordingly, as required by the *Police Act*, this matter was referred on June 1, 2026, to the Alberta Crown Prosecution Service (ACPS) for an opinion on whether charges should be laid.

On July 15, 2026, ASIRT received the requested opinion from the ACPS. No charges were recommended.

It is important to note that ASIRT and ACPS are bound by different standards when assessing the viability of charges arising out of an investigation. ASIRT, as the investigative body, applies a *Criminal Code* standard that determines whether reasonable grounds exist to believe that an offence has been committed. ACPS, based on its internal policy regarding criminal prosecutions applies a standard which examines whether there is a reasonable likelihood of conviction arising out of the evidence, and whether it is in the public interest to proceed with a prosecution. As is evident in this case, the application of these two different standards to the same investigation will, in some cases, result in different conclusions regarding the same file. In this case, while ASIRT found reasonable grounds to believe an offence had been committed, for the reasons provided in its opinion, the ACPS did not recommend that charges be laid.

Conclusion

In accordance with the opinion provided by ACPS, ASIRT will not lay charges against the SO.

Original Signed

Matthew Block
Executive Director

September 9, 2026

Date of Release