

Decision Regarding Findings Report INV-24-34 Concerning the Conduct of Gananoque Police Service Board Member John Beddows

Decision By:

Ryan Teschner, Inspector General of Policing

I INTRODUCTION

[1] This decision considers an allegation that John Beddows, a member of the Gananoque Police Service Board (“GPSB”), disclosed confidential information to the public that he obtained from closed GPSB meetings. Specifically, it is alleged that Mr. Beddows released confidential information about the Gananoque Police Service (“GPS”)’s response to a gathering of the Outlaws Motorcycle Club.

[2] Ontario’s Inspectorate of Policing (“IoP”) investigated this allegation to determine whether Mr. Beddows committed misconduct under the *Code of Conduct for Police Service Board Members Regulation*, O Reg 408/23 (“Code of Conduct”), enacted under the *Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019*, SO 2019, c 1, Sch 1 (the “Act”). An IoP inspector prepared a Findings Report¹ which is attached to this Decision as Appendix A. Following a review, I believed that the Findings Report disclosed evidence that Mr. Beddows committed misconduct in contravention of sections 4 and 15(1) of the Code of Conduct. Mr. Beddows was provided with a copy of the Findings Report and invited to make submissions pursuant to section 124(2) of the Act.

[3] Mr. Beddows disputes having committed misconduct and advances several grounds to support his position. He submits that the information he disclosed was neither sensitive nor confidential, and that the disclosure of information was consistent with his duties as mayor. He also submits his disclosure amounted to “political speech” that is protected by section 2(b) of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, Part I of the *Constitution Act, 1982*, being Schedule B to the *Canada Act 1982* (UK), 1982, c 11 (the “Charter”). Lastly, Mr. Beddows submits that the processes used during the IoP’s investigation, and my consideration of this matter, were procedurally unfair.

[4] I disagree with Mr. Beddows’ submissions. For the reasons that follow, I find Mr. Beddows violated sections 4 and 15(1) of the Code of Conduct by disclosing, without authorization of the GPSB, confidential information about a policing operation to the public. I also find the IoP’s processes were consistent with the Act and complied with the requirements for procedural fairness.

¹ Section 123 of the Act requires an IoP inspector who completes an investigation of a complaint to report their findings to the Inspector General. This report is redacted to comply with the *Publication of Findings Reports and Directions under Sections 123 and 125 of the Act Regulation*, O Reg 317/24.

II BACKGROUND

[5] Mr. Beddows is a member of the GPSB. He is also the mayor of Gananoque, and has a statutory right (but not an obligation) to sit on the GPSB by virtue of holding office as mayor.

[6] The Outlaws Motorcycle Club has a tradition of gathering in Gananoque every Friday the 13th. In 2024, the Outlaws Motorcycle Club was scheduled to meet in Gananoque on Friday, September 13, 2024 (the “Friday the 13th Gathering”). In anticipation of this, the GPSB held meetings which were closed to the public where the board discussed the GPS’s response to the upcoming gathering. These meetings included a discussion of the GPS’s operation in relation to the Friday the 13th Gathering, including how the GPS would be assisted by other police services in its response.

[7] The GPS planned to publish a news release about the Friday the 13th Gathering on September 12, 2024, one day before the gathering. The news release would include a reference to the Ontario Provincial Police (“OPP”).

[8] On September 11, 2024, before the GPS issued its news release, Mr. Beddows published statements about the Friday the 13th Gathering on his personal and mayoral Facebook accounts, and in the “Gananoque Town Hall”. Included in each of those statements was the comment that:

Our public order needs, if any, will be ably fulfilled by your Gananoque Police Service enabled by the assistance of supporting Services and Agencies.

Mr. Beddows’ statement was also published on September 11, 2024, in an article of The Recorder and Times.

[9] Mr. Beddows disclosed this information without the prior knowledge or approval of the GPSB. On the record before me, this disclosure also occurred without the prior knowledge of the GPS.

III ISSUES

[10] There are two issues I will consider in this decision:

1. Did Mr. Beddows commit misconduct contrary to sections 4 and 15(1) of the Code of Conduct? and,
2. Do the IoP's processes comply with the requirements for procedural fairness?

IV SUBMISSIONS OF MR. BEDDOWS

[11] Mr. Beddows does not dispute making the statements which underlie the allegation. Nor does he deny that the information he disclosed was discussed in closed GPSB meetings and that he did not obtain GPSB's authorization to disclose the information.

[12] Instead, Mr. Beddows submits that he did not commit misconduct because: (1) the information he provided in his statements was "what was already reported in prior media coverage", (2) he did not "identify specific agencies", and (3) Mr. Beddows was acting in his capacity as mayor when he released the information.

[13] Mr. Beddows also submits that the IoP's procedures did not comply with requirements for procedural fairness because: (1) the Findings Report did not contain a copy of news articles he provided an IoP inspector during his interview, (2) he did not have an opportunity to make submissions about the law, and (3) I failed to provide reasons for my interim decision that the Findings Report disclosed evidence that Mr. Beddows committed misconduct.

[14] Finally, Mr. Beddows also complained that he was subject to a direction under section 122 of the Act which required him to refrain from exercising his powers, or performing his duties, as a board member while the IoP's investigation was ongoing. This restriction was lifted on November 24, 2025. In light of this, and because this complaint is not relevant to the issue before me – that is, whether Mr. Beddows' committed misconduct and what Measure I may impose if I find he did – I will not address Mr. Beddows' submissions on this issue.

V ANALYSIS

ISSUE #1: Did Mr. Beddows commit misconduct contrary to sections 4 and 15(1) of the Code of Conduct?

[15] After a consideration of the facts and the applicable law, I find, on a balance of probabilities, that Mr. Beddows committed misconduct contrary to sections 4 and 15(1) of the Code of Conduct.

- a. Section 4 of the Code of Conduct requires members of a police service board to comply with the Act which prohibits the release of information obtained during closed board meetings

[16] Section 4 of the Code of Conduct states that, "A member of a police service board shall comply with the Act and the regulations made under it".

[17] The Act establishes that police service board meetings are presumptively open to the public. However, board meetings may be closed to the public in some circumstances, including where law enforcement information is to be discussed.²

[18] Where a board meeting is closed to the public, section 44(4) of the Act imposes an obligation on board members to preserve the confidentiality of all the information discussed in the meeting except in limited, statutorily-defined circumstances, or where authorized to disclose the information by way of a resolution of the board:

44(4) The members of the board or committee shall keep any matter considered in a meeting closed under subsection (2) or (3) confidential, including by keeping confidential any information obtained for the purpose of considering the confidential matter, except,

- (a) for the purpose of complying with an inspector exercising their powers or duties under this Act;
- (b) as may otherwise be required in connection with the administration of this Act, the *Special Investigations Unit Act, 2019* or the regulations made under either of them;
- (c) as may be required for a law enforcement purpose; or
- (d) where disclosure is otherwise required by law.

² Section 44(2)(k) of the Act permits a board meeting to be closed to the public where the subject matter being considered is "information that section 8 of the *Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* would authorize a refusal to disclose if it were contained in a record". Section 8 of the *Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection Act*, RSO 1990, c M.56 authorizes an institution to refuse to disclose statutorily-defined law enforcement information, including information whose release would interfere with a law enforcement matter, reveal law enforcement intelligence respecting organizations or hamper the control of crime.

(5) Despite subsection (4), a police service board may, by resolution, disclose or authorize a board member to disclose any matter considered in a meeting closed under subsection (2) or (3), which may include disclosing information obtained for the purpose of considering the confidential matter.

[19] It is not disputed that Mr. Beddows attended a closed meeting of the GPSB where he obtained information that the GPS would be working with external police services in their policing response to the Friday the 13th Gathering. Despite his obligation as a board member to preserve the confidentiality of this information, Mr. Beddows released this information to the public several times, in different media outlets and in public social media posts.

[20] Mr. Beddows was not authorized to make the statements by the GPSB, and none of the exceptions enumerated in section 44(4) of the Act, which otherwise would permit the release of this information, apply in these circumstances.

b. Section 15 of the Code of Conduct prohibits members of a police service board from releasing information obtained in the course of their duties without prior authorization from the board

[21] Section 15 of the Code of Conduct similarly imposes an obligation on board members to preserve the confidentiality of information obtained in the course of their duties, except where authorized to disclose the information by the board or as required by law, or where the information was already made public by an authorized person:

- 15 (1) A member of a police service board shall not disclose to the public information obtained or made available in the course of the member's duties except as authorized by the police service board or as required by law.
- (2) Subsection (1) does not apply to information that was already made available to the public by a person who was authorized to do so prior to the member's disclosure.

[22] Mr. Beddows clearly obtained information about the GPS's policing response to the Friday the 13th Gathering in the course of his duties as a board member. As I will discuss below, it was in that capacity that he attended GPSB meetings. Mr. Beddows was not authorized by the GPSB to release this information, and no authorized person had released the information pertaining to the 2024 Friday the 13th Gathering prior to him making the public statements.

c. Previous media releases about the Friday the 13th gatherings of the Outlaws Motorcycle Club in Gananoque are not relevant to the finding of misconduct

[23] Mr. Beddows submits that he did not disclose information beyond what had already been previously reported in the media in past years. To substantiate this, he provided the IoP with several news articles.

[24] The prior media coverage that Mr. Beddows refers to dates back to 2023 and relates to Friday the 13th events in a previous year – not the event in 2024 that was the subject of the complaint that led to this Decision.

[25] What the media covered in previous years is not relevant. What is relevant is what information Mr. Beddows obtained in closed meetings of the GPSB and whether he disclosed any of that information in a non-closed setting. On Mr. Beddows' own admissions during this inspection, he did.

[26] Even if I found the news articles Mr. Beddows provided the IoP contained the same information that he released publicly - which I do not - this would not be the end of the inquiry. The media can obtain information that is not meant for the public through a variety of means, and board members cannot disclose or confirm confidential information simply because it is publicly available or the media gained access to it somehow. As stated in section 15(2) of the Code of Conduct, board members are only permitted to disclose confidential information that is already publicly available where that information was made public by an authorized person. That did not occur here.

d. Board members are not permitted to disregard their confidentiality obligations because they personally view information as non-sensitive

[27] Mr. Beddows seems to define the confidential information at issue as the names or identities of the specific agencies that were assisting the GPS with their response to the Friday the 13th Gathering, but that is not an accurate definition of the confidential information at issue. Rather, the very fact that the GPS was cooperating and relying on assistance of other police services – whichever ones they were – is itself material information related to the conduct of a specific policing operation that was provided in a confidential setting due to its nature and sensitivity.

[28] Releasing that information to the public was not the role of Mr. Beddows. The release of that information was something planned and coordinated between the GPS and the assisting police services, specifically, the OPP. There could be many reasons why the timing of the release of this kind of information is important and delicate. Regardless, the information that any assistance was being provided to the GPS for law enforcement for this specific policing operation was confidential. It is not for a board member to redefine the parameters of what is confidential after the fact.

e. A board member's status as mayor does not justify or excuse the release of confidential information

[29] In his interview with the IoP inspector and later in his submissions to me, Mr. Beddows asserted that he made the information public in his capacity as mayor, and not in his capacity as a member of the GPSB. He stated that he had the statutory ability – in fact, suggested a duty – to make information about public safety known as part of his role as mayor. He further characterized this information as “political speech” protected by section 2(b) of the *Charter*. I do not agree with Mr. Beddows’ submissions on these points, and will provide my reasons below.

- i. *Mr. Beddows obtained the information in his capacity as board member and was obliged to comply with the Code of Conduct*

[30] While I understand Mr. Beddows’ position that, as mayor, he feels it important to communicate certain public safety information to his constituents, the facts of this case make this position about potential role confusion – or, as it has sometimes been called, the “two hats” issue³ – easier to dispense with.

[31] Mr. Beddows received confidential information from the GPS at a closed GPSB meeting in his capacity as a board member. He did not receive this information in another forum or in his role as mayor. Put another way, but for his attendance at the GPSB meeting and receiving the confidential information there, he would not have had it.

[32] I understand that Mr. Beddows takes the view that the social media posts and media article he wrote were done in his capacity as mayor, and not as a board member representing the views of the GPSB. I do not agree with this. Once again, Mr. Beddows received the confidential information only through his role on the GPSB and, as GPSB member, was required to abide by the duty of confidentiality in the Act and Code of Conduct.

³ The “two hats” metaphor was first reported in the Ontario Civilian Police Commission (“OCPC”) decision in *Bennett (Re)*, 2014 ONCPC 2504 (*Bennett*). There, Peterborough mayor Daryl Bennett, who was also a police service board member, claimed that he wore the hat of a police service board member at the same time as he wore the hat of the mayor. Moreover, Bennett argued that “the mayor’s ‘hat sits on top’ of all other hats”. In its decision, the OCPC soundly rejected this position, which ignored the additional legal duties imposed on police service board members by the legislation that could not be avoided, even by a mayor. Media stories reporting on a subsequent appeal of the decision indicate that the OCPC and mayor entered into some manner of settlement wherein OCPC revisited its decision ([Global News: Peterborough Mayor Daryl Bennett returns to police services board after 5-year hiatus](#)). I have, however, been unable to secure a copy of this settlement or any endorsement by the Divisional Court. Nonetheless, I remain persuaded by and adopt the original OCPC reasoning in respect of the ‘two hats’ metaphor.

[33] When Mr. Beddows sits around the table as a board member, he has specific statutory duties, responsibilities, and obligations as a board member. He is not sitting around that table as mayor, and while this may, at times, be challenging to reconcile, it is possible, and it was not difficult here. Mr. Beddows simply made a unilateral decision to prefer one role he occupies over another. This unilateral decision is not and cannot become a licence for Mr. Beddows, or other police service board members who occupy dual roles, to disregard their confidentiality obligations.

[34] Every board member must abide by the duty of confidentiality, even where they are a board member by virtue of their statutory office as mayor (or municipal councillor, in other cases). A board member that is also a mayor cannot self-determine to wipe aside the duty of confidentiality when they wish to communicate confidential information in another forum or in their capacity as mayor. Said another way, putting the title “Mayor” on a social media post or published editorial does not erase the misconduct that occurs when that person is a board member and has released confidential information without explicit authorization of the police service board. The harm to public safety that could be caused by permitting such an approach is clear and must be avoided.

ii. *The duties of a mayor and a board member are distinct and reconcilable*

[35] In Ontario’s police governance system, the statutory obligations of a police service board member do not take a back seat to the responsibilities of municipal elected office, whether it is the role of mayor or councillor. This principle is foundational and must be understood by all board members who also serve in elected municipal office.

[36] The misconception at the core of Mr. Beddows’ submissions to me is that his mayoral duties override his police service board obligations, including confidentiality obligations. This is both wrong and troubling. These roles are distinct, and their coexistence is baked into law. Mr. Beddows’ misconception is not only inconsistent with Ontario’s statutory realities, but also principles of modern police governance that have been affirmed by a long line of learned judges in public inquiries, independent reviews and other oversight processes (Paul S. Rouleau, *Report of the Public Inquiry into the 2022 Public Order Emergency* (2023); Gloria J. Epstein, *Missing and Missed: Report of The Independent Civilian Review into Missing Person Investigations* (Toronto: 2021); Murray Sinclair, *Interim Report of the Honourable Murray Sinclair submitted to the Executive Chair, Ontario Civilian Police Commission* (2017); John W. Morden, *Independent Civilian Review into Matters Relating to the G20 Summit* (Toronto: 2012) (the “Morden Report”)).

[37] There is no hierarchy of duties to wrestle with, and one statutory role (mayor) does not override the other (board member). I see nothing in section 225 of the *Municipal Act, 2001*, SO 2001 c 25 (“*Municipal Act*”) – which outlines the six components of the “role of head of council” (i.e. mayor) – nor in Part VI.1 of the *Municipal Act* – that catalogues the “special powers and duties of the head of council” – that conflicts with any of a board member’s statutory duties under the Act or Code of Conduct, including the duty to maintain confidentiality over board information.

[38] Nor do these *Municipal Act* responsibilities assign the duty to ensure adequate and effective policing to a mayor. That duty lies exclusively with police service boards. Mr. Beddows argues that, as mayor, he is responsible to “ensure public order to support … confidence in our security services, full stop.” While a mayor is within their rights to speak on public safety matters, mayors do not hold operational or governance authority over policing. Rather, the specific statutory responsibility to ensure adequate and effective policing resides with police service boards. Section 10 of the Act is unequivocal:

10 (1) The police service boards and the Commissioner shall ensure adequate and effective policing is provided in the area for which they have policing responsibility in accordance with the needs of the population in the area and having regard for the diversity of the population in the area.

[39] Mr. Beddows also submits that section 226.1 of the *Municipal Act* requires him to promote the public’s involvement in the municipality’s activities and to ensure community well-being. However, these duties do not authorize the disclosure of confidential board information. Having the general statutory responsibility to promote public involvement in the municipality’s activities and ensure community well-being is not a licence to release confidential information obtained as a police service board member. If Mr. Beddows believed disclosure was necessary, he could have sought the authorization of the GPSB, as permitted by section 15(2) of the Code of Conduct. He did not do so. Acting unilaterally breached his obligations.

[40] Again, I do not see any conflict between Mr. Beddows’ role as a board member, and his role as mayor. Confidential information obtained as a board member must remain confidential. If, as a result of his role as mayor, Mr. Beddows wanted to obtain and use this information, he should have taken appropriate steps. He could have requested a briefing as mayor, and could have engaged the GPS in a discussion about what, if any, information concerning the Friday the 13th Gathering he could release publicly in his capacity as mayor.

[41] Mr. Beddows submissions amount to an assertion that his role as mayor exempts him from the Code of Conduct. I certainly do not agree. I have not disregarded, as the submissions assert, the “interplay between Mr. Beddows’ dual roles as mayor

and a Police Service Board member". Once again, these two worlds can coexist, and any "interplay" does not create a licence for a mayor (or councillor) that sits on a police service board to violate their legal confidentiality obligations.

[42] Mr. Beddows also suggests that the moment he decided to occupy his seat on the GPSB, the GPSB somehow consented to him possessing a "dual role" as a board member and as mayor, and that this constitutes permission for him to release confidential information obtained as a board member if he determines it is necessary in his capacity as mayor. Far from being a legitimate defence to this misconduct, this submission ignores the statutory reality that a mayor is the sole decider of whether to occupy their seat on a police service board. The board itself has no ability to accept or refuse a mayor taking their seat. Suggesting that by virtue of a mayor taking their legally entitled seat, the board consents to whatever they choose to do in their capacity as mayor – even where they violate their obligations as a board member – is untenable. On the contrary: once a mayor (or councillor) makes the choice to sit as a member of the police service board, compliance with the Act and the Code of Conduct is mandatory.

[43] In short, the role as mayor (or councillor) and police service board member can coexist. What they require is discipline: board members must uphold confidentiality and other statutory duties. Being a mayor (or councillor) does not create an 'escape hatch' from the Code of Conduct.

iii. *The requirement for board members to keep information confidential is consistent with the Charter*

[44] Mr. Beddows also submits that his release of confidential information about a specific policing operation was "political speech" that is protected by virtue of his statutory office as mayor of Gananoque. I reject this characterization.

[45] Mr. Beddows' disclosure of confidential information is a violation of the Code of Conduct that is not saved by section 2(b) of the *Charter*. The law is clear: one's *Charter* right to freedom of expression can be reasonably limited by confidentiality obligations attached to certain officials, office-holders and regulated professions. That is the case here.

[46] Section 2(b) of the *Charter* guarantees that, "Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms ... freedom of thought, belief, opinion and expression, including freedom of the press and other media of communication." This *Charter* right protects political speech.

[47] Section 1 of the *Charter* further clarifies that certain *Charter* rights and freedoms – including freedom of expression under section 2(b) of the *Charter* – may be subject to reasonable limits:

1. The *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* guarantees the rights and freedoms set out in it subject only to such reasonable limits prescribed by law as can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society.

[48] Courts have recognized the particular importance of elected officials' speech to democratic debate. L'Heureux-Dubé and Lebel JJ, in *Prud'homme v Prud'homme*, 2002 SCC 85, at para 42, succinctly described the reasons for this:

Elected municipal officials are, in a way, conduits for the voices of their constituents: they convey their grievances to municipal government and they also inform them about the state of that government (Gaudreault-Desbiens, *supra*, at p. 486). Their right to speak cannot be limited without negative impact on the vitality of municipal democracy, as

Professor P. Trudel noted in an article entitled "Poursuites en diffamation et censure des débats publics. Quand la participation aux débats démocratiques nous conduit en cour" (1998), 5 B.D.M. 18, at p. 18:

[translation] Municipal democracy is based on confrontation between views and on open, and sometimes vigorous and passionate, debate. Discussion about controversial subjects can occur only in an atmosphere of liberty. If the rules governing the conduct of such debates are applied in such a way as to cause the people who participate in them to fear that they will be hauled before the courts for the slightest breach, the probability that they will choose to withdraw from public life will increase.

[49] However, courts have also recognized that the *Charter* guarantee to freedom of expression is not absolute – even for elected officials. In *Purd'homme*, the Supreme Court of Canada held that defamation law can limit elected officials' freedom of expression. Similarly in *Buck v Morris*, 2015 ONSC 5632, Edwards J held that a municipal Code of Conduct was a reasonable limit on an elected town councillor's freedom of expression:

The right to freedom of speech in our society is not an absolute right. While freedom of speech is a cherished right in a free and democratic society, there are reasonable limitations. The Town of Aurora, like many towns and cities in the Province of Ontario, has a Code of Conduct that purports to codify parameters of reasonable conduct for elected Town officials. One of the provisions in the Town Code is a requirement that elected officials refrain from publicly criticizing Town staff. The reason for this limitation is obvious. Employees of the Town of Aurora are like federal and provincial civil servants. They have no ability to respond to public criticisms made of them in a public forum.

[50] The same principle applies here. Board members' duty of confidentiality is a reasonable and necessary limit on expression. It ensures relevant information – including about sensitive police operations – can be provided to board members by the chief of police so the board can make informed governance and oversight decisions, and ultimately, fulfil their core legal duty to ensure adequate and effective policing.⁴

[51] This “information exchange”, as the Honourable John W. Morden titled it in his report, is essential to the proper functioning of the relationship between police boards and chiefs of police (Morden Report at p. 85, 87):

[T]he nature of how a police service functions will usually involve the chief of police coming into possession of information that the police board not only does not have, but does not necessarily know exists at all. As a result, it is essential to ensure a mechanism exists for the flow of relevant information between these parties. In the interactions between a police board and chief of police, an *information exchange* must exist that will encourage the sharing of more information, including operational information ..., discussing and debating varying policy approaches, and defining the objectives of both the operation and the applicable policy framework surrounding it.

... An information exchange ... will help to ensure that an ongoing evaluation of the policing approach to a particular set of circumstances can occur and appropriate adjustments can be made to maximize the effectiveness of the overall policing approach in those circumstances.

[52] Judge Morden also specifically acknowledged that this “information exchange” sometimes involves sensitive information and, where this occurs, recommended that boards rely on legislative tools to preserve confidentiality (Morden Report at p. 7):

... Where sensitive law enforcement matters are concerned, the Board should resort to the appropriate statutory measures to maintain confidentiality of information where appropriate.

⁴ In *Bennett*, the mayor of Peterborough also argued that Code of Conduct requirements which restricted the speech of police service board members violated his right to freedom of expression as an elected office holder. In rejecting this, the (now dissolved) Ontario Civilian Police Commission (“OCPC”) held that the restriction was justifiable under section 1 of the *Charter* given “the importance of public confidence in policing as well as confidentiality and security concerns related to the position of a [police service board] member.” The OCPC further noted that the scope of the restriction was minimal and directly connected to the obligations of board members, which is a voluntary role that no one is forced to occupy (*Bennett* at paras 43-44, 49). As indicated in footnote 3, there are media reports that the OCPC later revisited this decision. Nevertheless, I find the OCPC’s reasoning persuasive as it relates to reasonable limits on a board member’s expression and adopt it for the purposes of this decision.

[53] The provision of confidential information by a chief of police to a board ensures that board members are aware of police operations or other sensitive matters (e.g. human resource or litigation matters). This information is crucial for boards to have when making its governance decisions. Without this information, board members may not be aware of matters over which they have jurisdiction, and a board may then fail to fulfill its statutory governance and oversight responsibilities.

[54] The flow of this sensitive information necessarily requires board members to keep the information about day-to-day operations and the administration of the police service that they receive confidential. That is why this requirement of confidentiality is explicitly codified in both the Act broadly, and in the Code of Conduct applicable to each individual Ontario police service board member. Without confidentiality obligations, the “information exchange” would collapse.

[55] Taken to its conclusion, Mr. Beddows’ position on this issue would enable him, and any other mayor or municipal council member that sits on a police service board in the province, to decide, on their own, that confidential information they obtain around the police service board table can be used by them in another forum owing to the fact that they have another role where they deem that information useful. Permitting this downgrading of the board member duty of confidentiality could not only compromise the confidential and sensitive nature of law-enforcement information that board members are entitled to and should obtain, but could also lead to a chilling effect. Chiefs of police would understandably be more reluctant to provide information that boards do need, because they would be concerned about it making its way into the public domain. Far from advancing the interests of public safety, this type of situation would impair public safety.

[56] Confidentiality obligations in this context are comparable to those binding other professionals, such as lawyers and doctors, whose expression is sometimes limited to preserve trust and enable the free-flow of sensitive information necessary for that professional to do their job (*McInerney v MacDonald*, [1992] 2 S.C.R. 138 at 16; *R v McClure*, 2001 SCC 14 at paras 31-33).

[57] The board member confidentiality requirement that applies to Mr. Beddows is proportionate and minimally impairing. It applies to information that is obtained in a board member’s official capacity, and is directly connected to the legislative objective of maintaining effective police governance in Ontario – in this case, the proper functioning of the GPS and GPSB. Accordingly, I find that Mr. Beddows’ reliance on section 2(b) of the Charter does not shield his conduct from scrutiny, or, from my determination that he misconducted himself.

ISSUE #2 The Inspectorate of Policing's processes were procedurally fair

[58] I will now address Mr. Beddows' submissions that the processes used by the IoP did not comply with the requirements for procedural fairness.

i. *The Findings Report is not required to contain irrelevant evidence*

[59] In his submissions, Mr. Beddows argued that the IoP's process was fundamentally flawed because the Findings Report, upon which my decision is based, did not contain a copy of news articles gathered during the investigation. These news articles were provided by Mr. Beddows to the IoP during his initial interview and Mr. Beddows submits that their absence in the Findings Report is "highly prejudicial" because they contain information about the policing operations used in a previous year.

[60] As indicated above, these news articles do not relate to the Friday the 13th Gathering in 2024, but instead pertain to the policing of this event in the past. I do not agree that the absence from the Findings Report of media articles that predate the events that were the subject of this complaint and investigation/inspection is "highly prejudicial," or prejudicial at all. These articles were not relevant to the matter that was the subject of this inspection.

[61] Mr. Beddows submits that the "Inspector General's decision appears to rely solely on [the Findings Report] without considering all relevant evidence." This is tantamount to suggesting the Inspector General is required to 'redo' the inspection already conducted. The decision-making process of the Inspector General is not a redo of the inspection already carried out by the appointed inspector – rather, the Act makes clear in section 123 that after an inspection is complete, the inspector provides their "findings" to the Inspector General:

123 (1) An inspector who completes an inspection under this Part shall report his or her findings to the Inspector General.

[62] "Findings" are the inspector's summary of all relevant evidence and factual conclusions based on that evidence as it relates to the matter to be determined. "Findings" are not akin to the inspector dumping the entire investigative file on the Inspector General's desk and leaving the Inspector General to sift and determine what is relevant versus what is not. The way an inspector provides their "findings" to the Inspector General is through a Findings Report, which includes all factual information relevant to the issue to be determined – here, whether Mr. Beddows committed misconduct by breaching the requirement for confidentiality.

[63] In addition, only relevant information need be included in the Findings Report, and the Act makes clear that the Findings Report – and the board member's submissions, where applicable – is the sole basis upon which the Inspector General makes their decision. Of course, inspectors have discretion to include or not include certain information, and if relevant information was not included or considered in the Findings Report, there would be a basis for an argument that the Inspector General did not consider all relevant information in making their decision. Here, Mr. Beddows had full opportunity to and did participate in the investigation, with the ability to put forward his position and identify any relevant information. However, the information that is now being identified as important is actually not relevant to the matter I must decide.

ii. *Board members have an opportunity to make submissions on law before a finding of misconduct*

[64] In addition, Mr. Beddows submits that he had no opportunity to make submissions on the law related to misconduct before he was provided with a copy of the Findings Report and invited to make submissions. He complains this renders the process unfair.

[65] The Act sets out the process for inspections/investigations on board member conduct matters, and the process for the Inspector General to make the ultimate decision on whether misconduct has occurred:

- 124 (1) If, in the opinion of the Inspector General, the [Findings Report] discloses evidence that a member of a board has committed misconduct, the Inspector General may,
 - (a) reprimand the member of the board;
 - (b) suspend the member of the board for a specified period or until the member has complied with specified conditions; or
 - (c) remove the member from the board.
- (2) Before exercising a power under subsection (1), the Inspector General shall provide written notice of the proposed measures to the member and to his or her board and provide the member an opportunity to respond orally or in writing, as the Inspector General may determine.
- (3) After considering the response, if any, the Inspector General may implement the proposed measures, impose a lesser measure or rescind his or her intention to implement them.

[66] Section 124(2) of the Act establishes the timing for when a board member is invited to make submissions: before the Inspector General imposes a measure under section 124(1) of the Act, which necessarily is after the Inspector General reviews the Findings Report and forms the preliminary opinion that the board member committed misconduct.

[67] As a process prescribed by the Act, it is only after the Inspector General considers the Findings Report and the submissions of the board member (including with respect to relevant submissions on legal interpretation) that an actual 'Decision' is made and then rendered. Therefore, the process is designed to allow a board member – and Mr. Beddows in this case – to have the very opportunity he is alleging does not exist.

[68] In addition to submissions to me before I make my Decision, Mr. Beddows was also provided an opportunity to give a statement to an IoP inspector during the investigation. Therefore, Mr. Beddows had every opportunity to put forward any "submissions on law" during the inspection itself, and, of course, there is every opportunity for Mr. Beddows to do so in the submissions he has provided to me following my review of the Findings Report. In fact, he has done so.

iii. *The Inspector General is only required to provide reasons for their final decision*

[69] Finally, Mr. Beddows submits that the IoP violated the requirements for procedural fairness because he was not provided with the reasons for the Inspector General's preliminary opinion that the Findings Report contained evidence of misconduct.

[70] While common law requirements for procedural fairness will sometimes require reasons for a decision, reasons are not required for all administrative decisions, particularly preliminary decisions that do not provide a final determination of rights and instead concern procedural matters (*Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration v Vavilov*, 2019 SCC 65 at para 77; *R.N.L. Investments v British Columbia (Agricultural Land Commission)*, 2021 BCCA 67 at paras 64-65).

[71] The initial determination – "the opinion of the Inspector General, [that] the [Findings Report] discloses evidence that a member of a board has committed misconduct – was procedural in nature, and, by itself, had no impact on Mr. Beddows other than triggering the statutory right for him to provide submissions. It is not comparable to a final determination of rights, such as the one I make in this Decision.

[72] It is also not accurate to state that my interim decision is all that Mr. Beddows was provided when he was invited to make submissions. Section 124(2) of the Act only requires that the Inspector General provide the board member with “written notice of the proposed measure” – but, Mr. Beddows was provided with more information than this even at that stage. He was provided the Findings Report, which was the complete material before me when I made my interim decision. In addition, Mr. Beddows was provided a copy of the provisions under the Act and Code of Conduct which were under my consideration when I made my interim decision.

VI CONCLUSION

[73] I find that Mr. Beddows committed misconduct in contravention of sections 4 and 15(1) of the Code of Conduct when he publicly released confidential information that he obtained at a meeting of the GPSB that was closed to the public. In addition, I find the IoP’s processes comply with requirements for procedural fairness.

VII MEASURE IMPOSED

[74] The requirement for board members to keep certain matters confidential is critical to maintain the information exchange between chiefs of police and police service boards that is essential for boards to fulfil their statutory governance function.

[75] In light of the importance of this confidentiality and based on the facts of this case, I would have imposed a suspension on Mr. Beddows under section 124(1)(b) of the Act for a breach of the Act and the Code of Conduct. However, at the outset of this investigation on December 5, 2024, Mr. Beddows was directed by the Deputy Inspector General of Policing to decline to exercise his powers and perform his duties as a member of the GPSB while the investigation was ongoing (pursuant to section 122 of the Act). Having considered that Mr. Beddows has effectively served a substantial period of suspension already, I am exercising my discretion to not impose a measure despite the finding of misconduct.

Date: December 17, 2025

Original Signed By

Ryan Teschner
Inspector General of Policing

FINDINGS REPORT

Gananoque Police Service Board Member:
John Beddows

**Section 106(1) Board Member
Conduct Investigation
(INV-24-34)**

Submitted to:
Ryan Teschner
Inspector General of Policing of
Ontario

September 2, 2025

Table of Contents

ABOUT THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICING AND THE INSPECTORATE OF POLICING.....	3
INTRODUCTION.....	4
OVERVIEW OF INVESTIGATION	4
The Complaint	4
The Subject Police Service Board Member	5
Applicable Legislative and Regulatory Provisions	5
SUMMARY OF THE INVESTIGATION CONDUCTED	6
Complainant Interview	6
Witness Interview.....	7
Subject Police Service Board Member Interview	8
Additional Material Collected and Reviewed.....	10
INVESTIGATION FINDINGS	13

ABOUT THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICING AND THE INSPECTORATE OF POLICING

The Inspector General of Policing drives improved performance and accountability in policing and police governance by overseeing the delivery of adequate and effective policing across Ontario. The Inspector General ensures compliance with the province's policing legislation and standards, and has the authority to issue progressive, risk-based and binding directions and measures to protect public safety. Ontario's Community Safety and Policing Act embeds protections to ensure the Inspector General's statutory duty is delivered independently from government.

The Inspector General of Policing leads the Inspectorate of Policing (IoP). The IoP provides operational support to inspect, investigate, monitor, and advise Ontario's police services, boards and special constable employers. By leveraging independent research and data intelligence, the IoP promotes leading practices and identifies areas for improvement, ensuring that high-quality policing and police governance is delivered to make everyone in Ontario safer.

In March 2023, Ryan Teschner was appointed as Ontario's first Inspector General of Policing with duties and authorities under the Community Safety and Policing Act. Mr. Teschner is a recognized expert in public administration, policing and police governance.

For more information about the Inspector General of Policing or the IoP, please visit www.iopontario.ca.

INTRODUCTION

This is a report to the Inspector General of Policing by an inspector appointed by the Inspector General, who has completed an investigation under Part VII of the [Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019](#) (CSPA).

OVERVIEW OF INVESTIGATION

The Complaint

The Inspector General of Policing received a complaint alleging that Mr. John Beddows – a member of the Gananoque Police Service Board (GPSB) and mayor of the Town of Gananoque – posted confidential information gained from a closed police service board meeting on the social media platform Facebook, as well as providing several media outlets with the same information.

The complainant alleged that the social media post and media articles contained information provided to the police service board by the police command staff during the closed sessions of the board held in the lead up to the event on September 13, 2024. The information included facts about Gananoque Police Service (GPS) operations and revealed the assistance of additional police agencies in policing the anticipated arrival of an outlaw motorcycle gang on Friday, September 13, 2024. The complainant claimed that this information was provided to the public prior to the scheduled police press release to be held September 12, 2024, a day before the event.

Interim Suspension of Subject Board Member

Upon review of the complaint, the Deputy Inspector General directed that, effective December 5, 2024, John Beddows decline to exercise his powers or perform his duties as a board member of the GPSB pursuant to subsection 122(1) of the CSPA. The interim suspension remains in effect until further notice.

The Subject Police Service Board Member

Name of Police Service Board: Gananoque Police Service Board

Subject Board Member: John Beddows

Length of Service (Term): Appointed 2022 - 2026

Previous Terms on Police Service Board: None

Specific Role Held on Police Service Board: Board Member

Previous Substantiated Misconduct: None

Applicable Legislative and Regulatory Provisions

[Section 35\(6\)](#) of the CSPA provides that every member of a police service board shall comply with the prescribed code of conduct.

[Section 44 \(4\)](#) of the CSPA provides that: The members of the board or committee shall keep any matter considered in a meeting closed under subsection (2) or (3) confidential, including by keeping confidential any information obtained for the purpose of considering the confidential matter, except,

- (a) for the purpose of complying with an inspector exercising their powers or duties under this Act;
- (b) as may otherwise be required in connection with the administration of this Act, the *Special Investigations Unit Act, 2019* or the regulations made under either of them;
- (c) as may be required for a law enforcement purpose; or
- (d) where disclosure is otherwise required by law.

[Ontario Regulation 408/23: Code of Conduct for Police Service Board Members](#) was reviewed having regard to the allegations made in the complaint and the following sections were deemed to be relevant:

- a) Section 3(1) - A member of a police service board shall not conduct themselves in a manner that undermines or is likely to undermine the public's trust in the police service board or the police service maintained by the board; and

- b) Section 6 - A member of a police service board shall comply with any rules, procedures, and by-laws of the police service board; and
- c) Section 12 - A member of a police service board shall not purport to speak on behalf of the police service board unless authorized by the board to do so; and
- d) Section 15(1) - A member of a police service board shall not disclose to the public information obtained or made available in the course of the member's duties except as authorized by the police service board or as required by law.

SUMMARY OF THE INVESTIGATION CONDUCTED

As part of the investigation process, interviews were conducted with the complainant, the subject board member, John Beddows of the GPSB, and a witness. Additionally, open-source material forming the basis of the complaint was gathered and reviewed, along with material provided by the subject board member during his interview.

Complainant Interview

An interview was conducted with the complainant.

The complainant explained that since 2018, the Town of Gananoque has been the location where a motorcycle club and affiliates meet every Friday the 13th. The complainant met with the GPSB prior to the event to notify them of the event and discuss the type of temporary assistance that the Gananoque Police Service (GPS) might need to ensure "adequate and effective policing." The complainant reported that the temporary assistance information was discussed during the closed sessions of the board leading up to the event on September 13, 2024.

The complainant indicated that the GPS and the Ontario Provincial Police (OPP) scheduled a media release on September 12, 2024, regarding the "Friday 13th event." On September 11, 2024, the GPS started receiving numerous requests from the media to provide a statement regarding the "Friday 13th event." According to the complainant, the subject board member instead took it upon himself to contact media outlets and respond to media inquiries, as well as make a post about the event on Facebook. The complainant stated that the subject board member put the GPS in disarray by his actions.

The complainant confirmed that the information shared by the subject board member was accurate, but that the GPS was not ready to deal with the untimely release of the information prior to the September 12, 2024 press release. Moreover, the revelation by the complainant that the GPS would receive the “assistance of supporting Services and Agencies” was confidential information, which predictably prompted media representatives to ask what agencies would be coming to assist.

The premature release of information by the subject board member did not tarnish their relationship with other police services; however, the complainant indicated that he had to inform the other police services that information was shared prematurely with the media and on a social media platform. The complainant reported no operational changes were needed as a result of the media release by the subject board member.

Following the event, the complainant contacted the media to understand how they became aware of specific information. He learned, for example, that it was the subject board member that had reached out to Global News. The complainant subsequently reported the subject board member’s conduct to the GPSB chair with a letter setting out his concerns.

The complainant explained that all CSPA requests for temporary assistance are addressed via closed sessions at the GPSB’s meetings. Some information discussed during the closed sessions is later released by the GPS media office. Other information is never released due to intelligence and security requirements.

Witness Interview

An interview was conducted with the witness.

The witness indicated that she spoke with the complainant on September 25, 2024, who informed her he was forwarding a complaint about board member John Beddows. The witness saw John Beddows’ social media post before the “Friday the 13th” event and she was “surprised by it.” She did not initially think the post contravened the GPSB by-laws but encouraged the complainant to file a complaint with the IoP. After speaking with him, the witness understood the impact that the social media post and media articles had on the police service staff. She understood that the police service received several media requests after the release of John Beddows’ social media post and media release, and that the police service staff had not been prepared to deal with media that day.

The witness indicated that she was unaware of the GPS plan regarding the “Friday the 13th” event as that was an operational issue, but she knew that a media release was already scheduled by the two police services.

The witness reported that the only part of the social media post that contained confidential meeting information related to the participation of “other agencies/police services” assisting the GPS. Once she was aware of the social media post and media articles, she did not do anything with the information since the following day was Friday the 13th. She explained, “It didn’t seem like a big crisis, so I did nothing.”

The witness noted that the Code of Conduct requires that any board announcements are done through the Chair and confirmed that John Beddows did not identify himself as a board member when speaking with the media or on his social media post – she believed that the subject board member was speaking in his capacity as mayor.

Furthermore, she indicated that although the board by-laws were not technically followed, “John’s posts were vague, and he didn’t provide details of who was providing us assistance.” She added, “I think the legislation is pretty clear and well covered. It is also covered by policy, procedure, and training.” Her only problem with the post was that it was made prior to the event.

Subject Police Service Board Member Interview

An interview was conducted with the subject board member, John Beddows.

The subject board member has been a board member on the GPSB since 2022. He confirmed that he has completed all the required training as per the CSPA. To his knowledge, he has never previously been investigated by the Ontario Civilian Police Commission or his board.

The subject board member explained that he has made comments in the past with the same content in his role as the mayor of Gananoque. The subject board member felt that the arrival of the Outlaws motorcycle gang was public knowledge as they come to Gananoque every “Friday the 13th.” He said, “there is no surprise there. This information is already in the public domain.” John Beddows mentioned that he was not breaching confidentiality as this was “public domain” information and that public safety was part of the mayor’s role that required him to communicate on behalf of the community.

The subject board member stated that it had become an accepted practice to be interviewed by the Global News and “I got before the curve.” He also confirmed his social media posts were made and posted on September 11, 2024. He gave the media interviews on the days they were requested, “whenever they requested them.”

The subject board member saw his Facebook posts and the media interviews as part of his role as the mayor of Gananoque. He believed it was his job “to ensure public order and to support confidence in our security services, full stop. To also remind the public that there would be a lot of motorcycles on the street.”

He explained that he was not familiar with GPSB by-laws, rules and procedures regarding media release and public communication. He noted, however, that if he had seen them, he did not remember. He stated, “I’m stated on record that the mayor’s responsibility is to communicate to the town... it is in writing in stone in the Municipal Act. I am the spoken man for the town and therefore I have a role and responsibility to communicate from the municipality.” The subject board member believes that he has roles in the CSPA and the Municipal Act, and that he fulfills both roles. He saw the roles of board member and mayor as inseparable. Furthermore, he stated that it was not hard to navigate both of his roles. He stated, “I don’t see myself in breach of confidence here.”

The subject board member further explained that prior to being the mayor of Gananoque he was in the military as an intelligence officer. He understood confidentiality, as he wrote the doctrine for it. John Beddows reported that closed meeting information would not be discussed at GPSB if it were a council meeting and vice versa. He said, “they are compartmentalized.”

The subject board member took the position that the posts and articles were issued in his role as a mayor and not as a board member. He explained that if the GPSB did ask him to speak on their behalf, then he would but, “I do not speak on behalf of the board. I speak for the Town.” The subject board member believed that the GPSB could release sensitive information at its discretion.

He indicated that there was no confidential information shared on the social media post nor with the media. John Beddows explained his understanding of the Code of Conduct for board members by indicating that, “my understanding is colour along the lines and respect confidentiality. Do not do anything that cross the line between police, procedure, and operation.”

He added:

Nothing that I said undermines the public trust, I acted as a mayor in the press releases and not as a board member of the Gananoque Police Service Board, I didn't say that I was speaking on behalf of the Board... it's Mayor John Beddows. None of the information disclosed or I put... let me rephrase this all the information was in the public domain and it was a repetition of other and prior Friday 13 events.

I never spoke out as a member of the police service board...all the statements were done as the mayor of Gananoque and there has to be a line there. If there is a conflict between the two pieces of legislation, then that is a Queens Park question. Not resolvable at my level and or the IG level.

Additional Material Collected and Reviewed

News Articles

Multiple online news media sources were reviewed for the purpose of examining the post and comments made by the subject board member.

Global News

On September 12 at 4:06 p.m., an article written by Kevin Nielsen was published by Global News titled, "Police in Ontario town prepare for Outlaw biker gang on 'Friday the 13th':"

For the past six years, members of The Outlaws, one of the oldest biker clubs in the world, have been gathering in Gananoque on Friday the 13ths and police and local officials have warned the public to expect the same on Friday. "We have become a gathering place for the Outlaws Motorcycle Club on Friday the 13th," Gananoque Mayor John Beddows told Global News. He says as long as the notorious gang does not cause any disturbances, they are welcome in the town. "We live in a country in a place where we have the right to travel freely, we have the freedom of association, and all people who respect the law and act lawfully are able to enjoy those rights and freedoms," he said.

Gananoque Now News

On September 12, 2024, an article written by Tim Baltz was published by the *Gananoque Now News* titled, “Gananoque Mayor issues statement regarding Outlaws on Friday the 13th.”

Tomorrow is Friday the 13th. Ahead of this day Gananoque Mayor John Beddows has this message for area residents. Beddows says this Friday the 13th weekend we can expect the presence of members of the Outlaws in Gananoque. Our public order needs, if any, will be ably fulfilled by your Gananoque Police Service enabled by the assistance of supporting Services and Agencies. I celebrate the rights we all have as Canadians to travel and gather freely, provided that laws and bylaws are respected.

Gananoque Town Hall

On September 11, 2024, an article written by John Beddows was published by the *Gananoque Town Hall* titled, “Message from the Mayor:”

I am writing this note as a public reminder that, as has become the practice over the last several years, this Friday the 13th weekend we can expect the presence of members of the Outlaws in Gananoque. Our public order needs, if any, will be ably fulfilled by your Gananoque Police Service enabled by the assistance of supporting Services and Agencies.

I celebrate the rights we all have as Canadians to travel and gather freely, provided that laws and bylaws are respected in doing so.”

The Recorder and Times

On September 11, 2024, and updated on September 12, 2024, an article written by Keith Dempsey was published by *The Recorder and Times* titled, “Warning over Outlaws in Gan on Friday:”

Gananoque Mayor John Beddows took time to notify the community of the motorcycle gang's arrival on Friday. "Our public order needs, if any, will be ably fulfilled by your Gananoque Police Service, enabled by the assistance of supporting services and agencies," reads Beddows's statement. "I celebrate the

right we all have as Canadians to travel and gather freely, provided that laws and bylaws are respected in doing so."

Facebook Post

The subject board member confirmed posting the following impugned entries on his personal and mayoral Facebook accounts on September 11, 2024:

[I am] writing a note as a public reminder that, as has become the practice over the last several years, this Friday 13th weekend we can expect the presence of members of the Outlaws in Gananoque. Our public orders need, if any, will be ably fulfilled by your Gananoque Police Service enabled by the assistance of supporting Services and Agencies. I celebrate the rights we all have as Canadians to travel and gather freely, provided that laws and bylaws are respected in so doing."

Both posts are signed "John S Beddows Mayor of Gananoque."

Gananoque Police Service Board - By-Law Number #115-2018

6. Duties of the Chair:

It shall be the duty of the Chair to:
Act as the sole spokesperson for the Board;

7. Duties of the Executive Assistant:

- 7.1 The Executive Assistant will:
 - a) Serve as the Administrative link between the Board, the Chief, the Board's Legal Counsel and Labour Negotiator, Committees of the Board, the media, and Members of the Community.

9. Meetings of the Board:

9.1 (d) The Board may exclude the public from all or part of a meeting or hearing if it is of the opinion that;

Matters involving public security may be disclosed and, having regard to the circumstances, the desirability of avoiding their disclosure in the public interest outweighs the desirability of adhering to the principle that proceedings be open to the public; or

...

(e) No person other than Board Members, Executive Assistant and invited persons will attend in-camera [Closed]meetings.

INVESTIGATION FINDINGS

I make the following findings, relying on the material and information collected during the investigation and now contained in this report:

1. On September 11, 2024, John Beddows made the following comment on both his personal Facebook account and the town of Gananoque Facebook account regarding an event happening September 13, 2024. “Good afternoon, everyone, I'm writing this note as a public reminder that, as has become the practice over the last several years, this Friday the 13th weekend we can expect the presence of members of the Outlaws in Gananoque. Our public order needs, if any, will be ably fulfilled by your Gananoque Police Service enabled by the assistance of supporting Services and Agencies. I celebrate the rights we all have as Canadians to travel and gather freely, provided that laws and bylaws are respected in so doing. Thank you, John S Beddows. Mayor of Gananoque”.

- a. John Beddows reported that he posted the comment on his personal and Town of Gananoque Facebook accounts.
- b. John Beddows stated that his comments were not made on behalf of the Board but as the Mayor of the Town of Gananoque.
- c. John Beddows indicated that the information in his post was public knowledge and was previously shared in past “Friday the 13th” events.

- d. The Witness indicated that they would have appreciated if John Beddows would have waited to post his comments until the Gananoque Police Service had made their press release regarding the event.
- e. The GPS press release about the Friday the 13th event was scheduled for September 12th, 2024.
- f. John Beddows made his comments on September 11, 2024, prior to the GPS press release. By doing so, the GPS had to reach out to the other agencies involved and notify them that information was released by John Beddows.
- g. John Beddows made his comments on September 11, 2024, prior to the GPS press release. The timing of these comments did not follow the established media release plan in place by GPS. As a result, the GPS was not prepared to deal with the media requests to confirm the information that was released by John Beddows.

2. On September 11, 2024, John Beddows conducted interviews with different media outlets.

- a. John Beddows indicated that he spoke as the mayor of Gananoque and not on behalf of the GPS Board.
- b. John Beddows indicated that the information in his post was public knowledge and was previously shared in past "Friday the 13th" events.
- c. John Beddows made his comments on September 11, 2024, prior to the GPS press release. By doing so, the GPS had to reach out to the other agencies involved and notify them that information was released by John Beddows.
- d. John Beddows made his comments on September 11, 2024, prior to the GPS press release. As a result, the GPS was not prepared to deal with the media requests to confirm the information that was released by John Beddows.

777 Bay Street, 7th Floor
Toronto, ON M5G 2C8
Tel: +1-416-873-5930 or 1-888-333-5078
www.iopontario.ca

Improving policing performance to make
everyone in Ontario safer.

Ce rapport est aussi disponible en français