



ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

in the matter of

a conduct hearing pursuant to the

Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act, RSC, 1985, c R-10

Between:

Chief Superintendent Marlene Bzdel

Designated Conduct Authority

and

Corporal Christian Chartier Regimental Number 46614

Subject Member

Conduct Board Decision

Gerald Annetts

June 2, 2020

Mr. Jordan Levis-Leduc, Conduct Authority Representative

Ms. Sara Novell, Subject Member Representative

SUMMARY

Corporal Chartier originally faced four allegations that he contravened the RCMP Code of Conduct. At issue was his failure to take appropriate action as an RCMP officer to aid a friend exposed to potential danger and the inaccurate statements he made during a subsequent Code of Conduct investigation in an attempt to minimize his failures.

The hearing of this matter was scheduled for the week of May 11, 2020. Prior to the hearing, the parties reached a resolution and the remainder of the proceeding was completed without the need for oral evidence or oral argument. Corporal Chartier admitted to two of the allegations and the remaining two allegations were withdrawn by the Conduct Authority. An Agreed Statement of Facts was presented by the parties, as was a joint submission on conduct measures.

Aided by the admissions of Corporal Chartier, the Conduct Board found allegations 1 and 3 to be established on a balance of probabilities. The Conduct Board accepted the parties' joint submission on conduct measures and imposed: (1) a financial penalty of 10 days, to be deducted from Corporal Chartier's pay; (2) a forfeiture of 10 days of annual leave; and (3) an ineligibility for promotion for a period of two years.

INTRODUCTION

[1] The conduct hearing in this matter was initiated by the Conduct Authority on July 9, 2019. Four allegations of misconduct were made against Corporal Chartier for incidents that occurred between June 1, 2018, and March 22, 2019. On July 10, 2019, I was appointed as the Conduct Board to determine the matter.

[2] On October 4, 2019, the *Notice of Conduct Hearing* containing the four allegations of misconduct was served on Corporal Chartier. The two allegations that the Conduct Authority ultimately proceeded with read as follows:

Allegation 1:

On or between June 1, 2018, and August 16, 2018, at or near Langley, in the Province of British Columbia, Corporal Christian Chartier failed to be

diligent in the performance of his duties and the carrying out of his responsibilities, including taking appropriate action to aid any person who is exposed to potential, imminent or actual danger, contrary to section 4.2 of the *Code of Conduct of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police*.

Particulars of Allegation 1

1. At all material times, you were a member of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (“RCMP”) and posted to “E” Division.
2. In June or July of 2018, you met with Ms. [F.W.]. At the time of your meeting, Ms. [F.W.] had visible bodily injuries.
3. You and Ms. [F.W.] had previously been in a romantic relationship. Although your romantic relationship had ended, you remained in contact. Following the end of your romantic relationship, Ms. [F.W.] commenced a relationship with Mr. [K.G.]. Ms. [F.W.] was allegedly subject to domestic violence during her relationship with Mr. [K.G.], which included both physical and sexual abuse. Ms. [F.W.]’s visible injuries at the time of your meeting were allegedly a result of Mr. [K.G.] abuse.
4. In your statement provided to Sergeant Simon Scott and Staff Sergeant Rick Kim on August 16, 2018 (your “initial statement”), you described Ms. [F.W.]’s visible bodily injuries as follows:
 - a. “she was b-badly bruised”;
 - b. “she was bruised everywhere”;
 - c. She had bruising on both her hands and her face.
5. The RCMP has implemented Policy relating to domestic violence. Chapter 2.4 of the *RCMP Operational Manual relating to Violence/Abuse in Relationships* states that:

“Violence/abuse in relationships investigations are a high priority and will be thoroughly investigated and handled expeditiously, maintaining the safety of those involved”.
6. During your meeting in June or July of 2018, Ms. [F.W.] advised you that she had ended her relationship with Mr. [K.G.] and that she needed a place to stay. You allowed Ms. [F.W.] to reside with you. You further allowed Ms. [F.W.] to change her home address to your home address.
7. After Ms. [F.W.] moved in with you, she began disclosing information in relation to the alleged abuse she sustained at the hands of Mr. [K.G.]. During your initial statement, you described the information she provided as follows:
 - a. Mr. [K.G.] was “*physical and very sexually abusive towards her*”;
 - b. Mr. [K.G.] “*used to beat her up all the time*”;

c. Mr. [K.G.] *“would look through her phone every day. Um, like she wasn’t allowed to go out. She wasn’t allowed to wear certain clothes to go out. She, very controlling guy”*;

d. Mr. [K.G.] would *“force her to have sex”*;

e. Mr. [K.G.] *“used to force sex on her like throughout their relationship and then he wanted to, apparently he used to record or wanted to record and put it on the internet and make money”*;

f. Mr. [K.G.] abuse of Ms. [F.W.] was *“throughout their one year relationship”*.

8. You observed Ms. [F.W.] receive phone calls from Mr. [K.G.]. You further observed that Mr. [K.G.] phone calls would cause Ms. [F.W.] to fear for her safety. During your initial statement, you explained that: Mr. [K.G.] would call Ms. [F.W.] *“50, 60 times a day”* and that *“[Ms. [F.W.]] wouldn’t really talk about it, but you could tell. Like she’d get panic attacks and she’d, every time h-her phone would ring. Like she would leave her phone on silent and you can tell just the way she’s [...] like breathing and stuff like that, that s-it was s-she was really bothered by it. She, I’m pretty sure she’s scared shitless of her life”*.

9. As a result of the information disclosed by Ms. [F.W.] regarding Mr. [K.G.], you conducted research on Mr. [K.G.]. You discovered that Mr. [K.G.] was involved in serious criminal activity.

10. You instructed Ms. [F.W.] to change her phone number to avoid receiving phone calls from Mr. [K.G.], which she did. Approximately one week later, Ms. [F.W.] began receiving phone calls from Mr. [K.G.]. You took no further action to ensure Ms. [F.W.]’s safety.

11. On or about July 31, 2019, Ms. [F.W.] attended your residence to retrieve personal belongings. Ms. [F.W.] was no longer residing with you. When she attended your residence. Ms. [F.W.] was on *“speaker phone”* with whom you believed to be Mr. [K.G.]. During your initial statement, you described the phone conversation between Mr. [K.G.] and Ms. [F.W.] as follows: a. *“[Ms. F.W.] came to the phone, or the door with the phone in her hand [...] They’re arguing [...] they’re going at it [...] they’re yelling at each other [...] he said like you have 10 minutes to get the fuck out of that place [...]”*.

12. You did not speak to Ms. [F.W.] while she attended your residence on July 31, 2019, to retrieve her personal belongings. You took no action to ensure Ms. [F.W.]’s safety.

13. Although you were presented with evidence that Mr. [K.G.] had allegedly physically and sexually assaulted Ms. [F.W.], you took no

action to ensure that the matter was reported and/or properly investigated.

14. Although Ms. [F.W.]’s bodily injuries were potential evidence that a criminal offence had occurred, you took no action to ensure that the evidence was preserved.

15. Although you became aware that Ms. [F.W.] feared Mr. [K.G.] and that Mr. [K.G.] was involved in serious criminal activity, you failed to take appropriate action to ensure her safety.

16. It is therefore alleged that you failed to be diligent in the performance of your duties and the carrying out of your responsibilities.

Allegation 3:

On or about December 4, 2018, at or near Langley, in the Province of British Columbia, Corporal Christian Chartier failed to provide complete, accurate and timely accounts pertaining to the carrying out of his responsibilities and the performance of his duties, contrary to section 8.1 of the *Code of Conduct of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police*.

Particulars of Allegation 3

1. At all material times, you were a member of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (“RCMP”) and posted to “E” Division.
2. In June or July of 2018, you met with Ms. [F.W.]. At the time of your meeting, Ms. [F.W.] had visible bodily injuries.
3. You and Ms. [F.W.] had previously been in a romantic relationship for a number of months. Although your romantic relationship ended, you remained in contact. Following the end of your romantic relationship, Ms. [F.W.] commenced a relationship with Mr. [K.G.]. Ms. [F.W.] was allegedly subject to domestic violence during her relationship with Mr. [K.G.], which included both physical and sexual abuse. Ms. [F.W.]’s visible injuries at the time of your meeting were allegedly a result of Mr. [K.G.] abuse of Ms. [F.W.].
4. During your meeting in June or July of 2018, Ms. [F.W.] advised you that she had ended her relationship with Mr. [K.G.] and that she needed a place to stay. You allowed Ms. [F.W.] to reside with you. You further allowed Ms. [F.W.] to change her home address to your home address.
5. After Ms. [F.W.] moved in with you, she began disclosing information in relation to the alleged abuse she sustained at the hands of Mr. [K.G.]. As a result of the information disclosed by Ms. [F.W.] regarding Mr. [K.G.], you conducted research on Mr. [K.G.]. You discovered that Mr. [K.G.] was involved in serious criminal activity.

6. On July 27, 2018, as part of an ongoing investigation, RCMP members attempted to conduct a Duty to Warn (“DTW”) upon Ms. [F.W.] due to her association with Mr. [K.G.]. When RCMP members attended Ms. [F.W.]’s residence, it was determined that Ms. [F.W.] resided with you. Both a Statutory and Code of Conduct investigation ensued.

7. On August 16, 2018, you provided a statement to Sergeant Simon Scott and Staff Sergeant Richard Kim as part of the Statutory investigation (your “initial statement”).

8. On December 4, 2018, you provided a statement to Acting Sergeant Nancy Manning and Acting Staff Sergeant Rafael Alvarez as part of the RCMP Code of Conduct Investigation (your “second statement”).

9. The information you provided regarding the extent of Ms. [F.W.]’s injuries during your initial statement is inconsistent with the information you provided during your second statement.

a. During your initial statement, you indicated that:

- i. *“when I first saw her she was b-badly bruised”*;
- ii. *“I could just see that she was bruised everywhere”*;
- iii. She had bruising on both her hands and her face;
- iv. *“I noticed some bruising on her hands, a little bit on her face, but not on her body”*.

b. During your second statement:

- i. When asked how Ms. [F.W.] looked when she first began staying with you, you responded: *“she looked fine, there’s nothing wrong with her. The only thing that she showed me was when I went to, to um, to the drive-in with her, she showed me that uh, she had like a, they had a fight where they were both hitting each other and uh, she just had some markings on her hands, some bruising on her knuckles from weeks before, before she moved in with her sister”*;
- ii. When asked: *“so all you really noticed or that she pointed out to you, was the knuckles, right? Did you notice anything on her face or [...] anything anywhere else?”* you responded: *“no”*;
- iii. You further stated that: *“the only physical stuff I saw on her was uh, just the bruising on her hand”*.

10. It is therefore alleged that you failed to provide complete, accurate and timely accounts pertaining to the carrying out of your responsibilities and the performance of your duties.

[*Sic throughout*]

[3] On December 15, 2019, after receiving an extension of time to do so, Corporal Chartier provided his response to the *Notice of Conduct Hearing* pursuant to subsection 15(3) of the *Commissioner's Standing Orders (Conduct)*, SOR/2014-291 [*CSO (Conduct)*]. He admitted to certain particulars and provided an explanation in relation to others, but he denied the allegations.

[4] The hearing of this matter was set for the week of May 11, 2020. On April 24, 2020, following the withdrawal of allegation 4 by the Conduct Authority, the parties advised the Conduct Board that an agreement in principle had been reached to resolve the matter. On May 11, 2020, the parties provided an Agreed Statement of Facts to the Conduct Board and a joint proposal in relation to conduct measures, which also included notice that the Conduct Authority was withdrawing allegation 2.

[5] The Agreed Statement of Facts in relation to allegations 1 and 3 tendered by the parties is as follows:

1. At all material times, [Corporal] Chartier (the "Subject Member") was a member of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police ("RCMP") and posted to "E" Division.
2. In June or July of 2018, the Subject Member met with Ms. [F.W.]. At the time of the meeting, Ms. [F.W.] had visible bodily injuries.
3. The Subject Member and Ms. [F.W.] had previously been in a romantic relationship. Although their romantic relationship had ended, they remained in close contact. Following the end of their romantic relationship, Ms. [F.W.] commenced a relationship with Mr. [K.G.]. Ms. [F.W.] was allegedly subject to domestic violence during her relationship with Mr. [K.G.], which included both physical and sexual abuse. Some of Ms. [F.W.]'s injuries at the time of their meeting were allegedly a result of abuse from Mr. [K.G.].
4. At some point between June and July of 2018, Ms. [F.W.] advised the Subject Member that she had ended her relationship with Mr. [K.G.] and that she needed a place to stay.

The Subject Member was off-duty and allowed Ms. [F.W.] to reside with him temporarily and encouraged Ms. [F.W.] to change her home address to his home address.

5. After Ms. [F.W.] moved in with the Subject Member, she began intermittently disclosing information in relation to the alleged abuse she sustained at the hands of Mr. [K.G.]. Although she indicated to the Subject Member that she did not [want] to report this matter, she continued disclosing some of the abuse she had been subjected to. Ms. [F.W.]'s disclosure included:
 - a. Mr. [K.G.] was “physical and very sexually abusive towards her”;
 - b. Mr. [K.G.] “used to beat her up all the time”;
 - c. Mr. [K.G.] “would look through her phone every day. Um, like she wasn't allowed to go out. She wasn't allowed to wear certain clothes to go out. She, very controlling guy”;
 - d. Mr. [K.G.] would “force her to have sex”;
 - e. Mr. [K.G.] “used to force sex on her like throughout their relationship and then he wanted to, apparently he used to record or wanted to record and put it on the internet and make money”;
 - f. Mr. [K.G.]'s abuse of Ms. [F.W.] was “throughout their one-year relationship”.
6. Towards the end of her stay with the Subject Member[,] Ms. [F.W.] informed the Subject Member that Mr. [K.G.] had been involved in a shooting outside a Langley restaurant. The Subject Member subsequently conducted a Google search of the incident and found out Mr. [K.G.]'s full name and learned that he was known to police. The Subject Member did not conduct further inquiries.
7. On July 27, 2018, as part of an ongoing investigation, RCMP members attempted to conduct a Duty to Warn (DTW) upon Ms. [F.W.] due to her association with Mr. [K.G.]. It was determined that Ms. [F.W.]'s listed address was the Subject Member's residence.

AT that time, she was no longer residing with the Subject Member but he facilitated the contact between Ms. [F.W.] and the RCMP members attempting to conduct [t]he DTW. Both a Statutory [Anti-Corruption Unit (ACU)] and Code of Conduct investigation ensued. The Subject Member provided 2 statements in that context, the first to Sergeant Simon Scott and Staff Sergeant Rick Kim (ACU) on August 16th, 2018; the second to Acting Sergeant Nancy Manning and Acting Staff Sergeant Rafael Alvarez (COC) on December 4th, 2018.

- [6] The Subject Member then made the following admissions in relation to allegation 1.
1. Although the Subject Member was presented with evidence that Ms. [F.W.] had allegedly been physically and sexually assaulted, the Subject Member took no action to ensure that the matter was reported and/or properly investigated, nor did he encourage Ms. [F.W.] to report it.
 2. During Ms. [F.W.]’s stay with the Subject Member, he observed Ms. [F.W.] receive daily repeated phone calls from Mr. [K.G.]. He instructed Ms. [F.W.] to change her phone number to avoid receiving phone calls from Mr. [K.G.], which she did. He also informed her of the possibility of obtaining a restraining order if she felt threatened. Approximately one week later, Ms. [F.W.] began receiving daily phone calls from Mr. [K.G.] again. The Subject Member observed that Mr. [K.G.]’s phone calls would cause Ms. [F.W.] to have panic attacks and really bother her, but took no further action.
 3. On or about July 31, 2018, Ms. [F.W.] attended the Subject Member’s residence to retrieve personal belongings. Ms. [F.W.] was no longer residing with the Subject Member. When she attended the residence, Ms. [F.W.] was on “speaker phone” with whom the Subject Member believed to be Mr. [K.G.]. The Subject Member believed Ms. [F.W.] and Mr. [K.G.] were arguing over the phone and yelling at each other. The Subject Member overheard Mr. [K.G.] stated words to the effect of: “you have 10 minutes to get the fuck out of that place”. The Subject Member did not speak to Ms.

[F.W.] while she attended his residence on July 31, 2018 and took no action to ensure Ms. [F.W.]’s safety at that time.

4. The Subject Member admits that he failed to be diligent in the performance of his duties and carrying out of his responsibilities.

[7] In order to find the allegations under section 4.2 of the Code of Conduct to be established, I must find that Corporal Chartier failed to be diligent in the performance of his duties and in the carrying out of his responsibilities. Corporal Chartier’s admission to the allegations is helpful, but that on its own is insufficient. The burden is on the Conduct Authority to prove the allegation on a balance of probabilities.

[8] The RCMP External Review Committee (ERC) has found that a breach of section 4.2 of the Code of Conduct will be found when the impugned conduct involves an element of willfulness or, alternatively, a degree of neglect that elevates the conduct from a mere performance issue to an issue of misconduct (ERC C-2015-010 (C-013), paragraphs 81 to 86; Commissioner agreed with ERC recommendation).

[9] The Divisional Court of Ontario restated this principle in the context of provincial police operations in *Ontario (Provincial Police) v Ontario (Independent Police Review Director)*, [2016] OJ No. 5397, at paragraph 30 :

30 To constitute neglect of duty, the impugned conduct must include an element of willfulness in the police officer’s neglect or there must be a degree of neglect which would make the matter cross the line from a mere job performance issue to a matter of misconduct.

[10] I take note of the existence of the following portions from the Operational Manual, Chapter 2.4:

[...]

2.1. Violence/abuse in relationships investigations are a high priority and will be thoroughly investigated and handled expeditiously, maintaining the safety of those involved.

[...]

3.1.1.7. As soon as possible, document on the investigational file all evidence obtained and steps completed during the initial investigation.

3.1.1.8. Investigators must notify their supervisor of any reported incidents of violence/abuse in relationships within 24 hours by submitting their Records Management System (RMS), e.g. PROS, PRIME-BC, Versadex Halifax, file for review.

[...]

3. 1. 3. 2. Refer the victim to Victim Services. If consent is not received, and in compliance with ch. 37.6. Victim Assistance, sec. 4.1.3., members should consider a proactive referral.

[...]

[11] In considering Corporal Chartier's previously noted admissions against these policy requirements, despite the fact that he was off-duty at the time, it is clear that he knew as an experienced police officer that he had a duty to report the assaultive behaviour and to document his observations. Ignoring that evidence and willfully neglecting to report it amounts to a breach of section 4.2 of the Code of Conduct as alleged by the Conduct Authority. Therefore, I find allegation 1 to be established.

[12] Corporal Chartier made the following admissions in relation to allegation 3:

The Subject Member admits that the information he provided regarding the extent of Ms. [F.W.]'s injuries during his initial statement was incomplete and inconsistent with the information provided during his second statement.

a) During his initial statement, he indicated that:

- i. "when I first saw her she was b-badly bruised";
- ii. "I could just see that she was bruised everywhere";
- iii. She had bruising on both her hands and her face;
- iv. "I noticed some bruising on her hands, a little bit on her face, but not on her body".

b) During his second statement:

- i. When asked how Ms. [F.W.] looked when she first began staying with him, he responded: "she looked fine, there's nothing wrong with her. The only thing that she showed me was when I went to, to um, to the drive-in with her, she showed me that uh, she had like a, they had a fight where they were both hitting each other and uh, she just had some markings on

her hands, some bruising on her knuckles from weeks before, before she moved in with her sister”;

ii. When asked: “so all you really noticed or that she pointed out to you, was the knuckles, right? Did you notice anything on her face or [...] anything anywhere else? he responded: “no”;

iii. He further stated that: “the only physical stuff I saw on her was uh, just the bruising on her hand”.

[13] Allegation 3 is closely tied to allegation 1. Corporal Chartier admits that, on December 4, 2018, during the Code of Conduct investigation, he failed to provide complete and accurate accounts pertaining to the carrying out of his responsibilities and the performance of his duties. It is apparent from the Agreed Statement of Facts tendered by the parties that the answers he provided on that date were an attempt to minimize the evidence of abuse suffered by Ms. F.W. in order to justify his failure to take any action with respect to that evidence. That minimization amounts to a failure to provide a complete, accurate and timely account pertaining to the carrying out of his responsibilities and the performance of his duties.

[14] Both allegations 1 and 3 are accordingly established on a balance of probabilities.

CONDUCT MEASURES

[15] Having found that the allegations are established, I am required, in accordance with subsection 45(4) of the *Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act*, RSC, 1985, c R-10 [*RCMP Act*], and the *Conduct Measures Guide*, to impose “a fair and just measure that is commensurate to the gravity of the contravention, the degree of blameworthiness of the member, and the presence of mitigating and aggravating factors”. Pursuant to paragraph 36.2(e) of the *RCMP Act*, conduct measures must be “proportionate to the nature and circumstances of the contravention of the Code of Conduct, and where appropriate, that are educative and remedial rather than punitive”.

[16] I have reviewed the parties’ joint submission on measures and supporting documentation. They jointly propose a global sanction consisting of a forfeiture of pay of 10 days (80 hours), a forfeiture of annual leave of 10 days (80 hours) and an ineligibility for promotion for a period of two years.

[17] When presented with a joint submission on conduct measures, there are very narrow circumstances in which a conduct board may refuse to accept the proposed conduct measures. The Supreme Court of Canada has recognized the value of settlement discussions as well as the strong policy reasons that favour the promotion of certainty to the parties when a settlement is reached, see for example *Rault v Law Society of Saskatchewan*, 2009 SKCA 81 (CanLII), at paragraph 19; and *R. v Anthony-Cook*, 2016 SCC 43. Generally speaking, courts or administrative tribunals will not override a settlement reached by the parties unless doing so would be against the public interest. It is not a question of whether the conduct measures proposed are the same as what I would impose. Rather, the public interest test sets a much higher threshold for rejecting a joint submission on conduct measures and requires that I give it considerable deference.

[18] The parties have provided a thoughtful analysis in relation to the joint proposal put forward for my consideration; one that is in line with the precedent cases. On my review, I find that the range of conduct measures in this case is reasonably between the forfeiture of 10 days' pay and dismissal, depending on the mitigating and aggravating factors present.

[19] The parties have outlined several mitigating and aggravating factors that I accept as applicable:

- a. Corporal Chartier's admissions have avoided a contested hearing, which negated the need for multiple witnesses to travel and testify at considerable expense to the RCMP. It further demonstrated his willingness to resolve the matter quickly and to accept responsibility for his actions.
- b. The Conduct Authority is no longer seeking Corporal Chartier's dismissal.
- c. Corporal Chartier has 22 years of good service. However, as an experienced member of the Force with supervisory responsibilities, he failed to set the example expected of him.
- d. Corporal Chartier maintains the support of his immediate supervisor and colleagues.

- e. Corporal Chartier has prior informal discipline. However, given the dated and unrelated nature of that prior discipline, I subscribe minimal weight to it.

[20] In addition, I also find as a mitigating factor that Corporal Chartier did go out of his way to assist Ms. F.W. with her situation. While he failed to take the necessary action required of him as a police officer, as a friend, he did provide her with a place to stay and with some good advice while she got herself back on her feet. Not everyone would have done that and it should not be ignored.

[21] On the totality of the circumstances, I cannot find that the proposed measures are against the public interest. The parties have considered the relevant mitigating and aggravating factors and the proposed measures are within the possible range of financial penalties. They are classified as serious measures, and, as such, they will serve as a deterrent to Corporal Chartier as well as serve as a warning to other members. Therefore, I accept the parties' joint submission on conduct measures.

[22] In accordance with the joint submission presented by the parties, I impose the following conduct measures:

- a. pursuant to paragraph 5(1)(i) of the *CSO (Conduct)*: a forfeiture of 10 days of annual leave;
- b. pursuant to paragraph 5(1)(j) of the *CSO (Conduct)*: a financial penalty of 10 days, to be deducted from Corporal Chartier's pay; and
- c. pursuant to paragraph 5(1)(b) of the *CSO (Conduct)*: an ineligibility for promotion for a period of two years.

[23] Corporal Chartier is being allowed to continue his career with the RCMP with the hope that he will conduct himself with the respect, integrity and professionalism expected of him as a member of the RCMP. Given the misconduct to which he has admitted and the serious conduct measures imposed, it should be obvious that any future contravention of the Code of Conduct

will be viewed seriously by a conduct authority or conduct board and could lead to his dismissal from the Force.

[24] Any interim measures in place should be resolved in accordance with section 23 of the *Royal Canadian Mounted Police Regulations, 2014*, SOR/2014-281.

[25] Either party may appeal this decision by filing a statement of appeal with the Commissioner within 14 days of the service of this decision on Corporal Chartier, as set out in section 45.11 of the *RCMP Act* and section 22 of the *Commissioner's Standing Order (Grievances and Appeals)*, SOR/2014-289.

Gerald Annetts

June 2, 2020

Edmonton, Alberta

Conduct Board