

**Peel Regional Police**  
*Police Services Act* R.S.O. 1990, c. P. 15, as amended

**IN THE MATTER OF** a hearing held in accordance with section 76(9) of the *Police Services Act* into allegations of misconduct against Constable Michael KONWERSKI #3798 of the Peel Regional Police.

**Charge:                      Discreditable Conduct (1 Count)**

---

**Disposition**

---

**Hearing Officer**

**Superintendent Taufic Saliba**  
Peel Regional Police

**Prosecutor**

**Ms. Sharon Wilmot**  
General Counsel

**Co-Prosecutor**

**Inspector Scott Clair**  
Peel Regional Police

**Member Representative**

**Mr. Pierre Bernard**  
Peel Regional Police Association

## **PART I: OVERVIEW**

### **Allegations of Misconduct**

It is alleged that Constable Michael KONWERSKI #3798 ("Constable Konwerski"), a member of Peel Regional Police ("PRP"), committed the following act of misconduct contrary to section 80(1)(a) of the *Police Services Act*, R. S. O. 1990 c. P. 15, as amended;

### **Count One: Discreditable Conduct**

It is alleged Constable Konwerski committed Discreditable Conduct in that on July 28, 2021, he was found guilty of three (3) criminal offences punishable upon summary conviction, namely; Unauthorized Possession of a Prohibited Device contrary to s. 88(1) of the Criminal Code of Canada in relation to an incident which occurred on or about September 21, 2019 constituting an offence against discipline as prescribed in section 2(1)(a)(ix) of the Code of Conduct, Ontario Regulation 268/10, as amended.

### **Background**

Constable Konwerski appeared before me on November 22, 2021, in answer to a Notice of Hearing that was served on the officer on October 27, 2021, alleging one count of misconduct contrary to section 80(1)(a) of the *Police Services Act*, constituting offences against discipline, Discreditable Conduct, as prescribed in section 2(1)(a)(ix) of the *Code of Conduct, Regulation 268/10*, as amended.

### **Plea**

On February 18, 2022, Constable Konwerski appeared before me once again and entered a plea of guilty to one (1) count of Discreditable Conduct. An Agreed Statement of Facts was tendered as Exhibit #6 and read into the record. Based on those facts and the confirmation by Constable Konwerski that they were substantially correct, a finding of misconduct was registered.

### **Decision**

After examining and weighing all of the evidence presented, as the Hearing Officer, I impose on Constable Michael Konwerski #3798 of Peel Regional Police:

#### **Count One: Discreditable Conduct**

A reduction in rank from First Class Constable to Second Class Constable for a period of three (3) months, following which the officer will be returned to the rank of First Class Constable on the basis of satisfactory work performance to be determined by the officer's Divisional Commander, and

Perform any mandatory training, as ordered by the Peel Regional Police.

## **PART II: THE HEARING**

### **Exhibits**

The following exhibits were tendered during the hearing:

Exhibit #1	Delegation of Powers and Duties to a Hearing Officer (Supt. T. Saliba)
Exhibit #2	Designation – Prosecutor (Ms. Sharon Wilmot)
Exhibit #3	Designation – Co-Prosecutor (Insp. Scott Clair)
Exhibit #4	Notice of Hearing
Exhibit #5	Designation – Co-Prosecutor (Mr. Keegan Soles)
Exhibit #6	Agreed Statement of Facts
Exhibit #7	Joint Submission as to Penalty
Exhibit #8	Prosecution Submissions
Exhibit #9	Defence Submissions

### **Representation**

In this matter, Mr. Pierre Bernard represented Constable Konwerski and Ms. Sharon Wilmot, Mr. Keegan Soles and Inspector Scott Clair represented Peel Regional Police.

### **Agreed Statement of Facts**

The facts in this matter are substantially agreed upon by the Parties to this Tribunal. The Agreed Statement of Facts filed as Exhibit #6 states:

Constable Michael KONWERSKI #3798 has been a member of Peel Regional Police (PRP) since December 2012. He is currently assigned to 21 Division Mobile Crisis Rapid Response Team (MCRRT). At the time of the incident, he was assigned to 21 Division C Platoon.

#### **COUNT ONE – DISCREDITABLE CONDUCT**

On September 21, 2019, Constable Michael Konwerski (“Constable Konwerski”) was working a night shift at PRP 21 Division. He was operating police cruiser 30. At the end of his shift, he left his black backpack in the trunk of the police cruiser and reported off duty.

On September 28, 2019, cruiser checks were conducted in the underground parking lot of PRP 21 Division. The backpack was located in the trunk of cruiser 30 and was found to contain numerous personal items, including two prohibited rifle magazines, each loaded with 30 rounds of ammunition and one prohibited 40-calibre handgun magazine, loaded with 15 rounds of ammunition.

On September 29, 2019, Constable Konwerski attended the office of Staff Sergeant Dennis Edwards #1777 and advised him that the backpack was his and that he left the backpack in the trunk of the cruiser on September 21, 2019. Constable Konwerski provided an accurate description of the backpack and the items it contained.

The magazines and ammunition were tested and found to be operational and compatible with PRP issued firearms. These items were not issued by PRP and were classified as prohibited because they had been modified to exceed capacity.

On July 27, 2020, a DNA warrant was executed to collect Constable Konwerski's DNA. The comparison results revealed that Constable Konwerski DNA was a contributor of the DNA on the rifle magazines but not the handgun magazine.

Constable Konwerski had a valid Possession and Acquisition Firearms license for non-restricted and restricted firearms. He lawfully purchased the items and then modified them to allow them to hold more than the legal capacity. He did not have a firearms licence that allowed him to legally possess the firearm magazines and was aware that the modifications would classify them as prohibited devices.

As a result, Constable Konwerski was arrested and charged with three (3) counts of Possession of a Prohibited Device, three (3) counts of Careless storage of a Prohibited Device and one (1) count of Careless Storage of Ammunition.

On July 28, 2021, Constable Konwerski pleaded guilty to and was convicted of three (3) counts of Unauthorized Possession of a Prohibited Device by the Honourable Justice S. Caponecchia in the Ontario Court of Justice in the City of Brampton.

Constable Konwerski was given a conditional discharge and he was placed on a 12-month probation order with conditions including to report to a probation officer, perform community service, perform mandatory training as per Peel Regional Police and pay a victim surcharge. The firearm magazines and ammunition were ordered to be forfeited and disposed. The three (3) counts of Careless Storage of a Prohibited Device and one (1) count of Careless Storage of Ammunition charges were withdrawn.

The actions of Constable Konwerski in being found guilty of criminal offences for Unauthorized Possession of a Prohibited Device, constitute Discreditable Conduct under 2(1)(a)(ix) of the prescribed Code of Conduct.

## **Positions on Penalty**

The Parties representing the Prosecution and Defence provided a joint submission with respect to penalty on February 18, 2022, tendered as Exhibit #7. They propose that the appropriate disposition for the finding of one (1) count of Discreditable Conduct is as follows:

- a) Reduction in rank from 1st (first) Class Constable to 2<sup>nd</sup> (second) Class Constable for a period of 3 (three) months following which the officer will be returned to the rank of 1st (first) Class Constable on the basis of satisfactory work performance to be determined by the officer's Divisional Commander; and
- b) Perform any mandatory training, as ordered by the Peel Regional Police.

## **Submissions**

### **Prosecution – Inspector Scott Clair**

Inspector Clair commenced his submission and put forward that the proposed penalty was reflective of the applicable mitigating and aggravating factors, and was consistent with penalties imposed in similar cases.

Inspector Clair also submitted that the Service must consider several factors as set out in *Krug and Ottawa Police Service* (OCCPS - 2003) as follows:

#### **Nature of the Misconduct**

Inspector Clair stated that any criminal conviction against a police officer is a serious matter. Further, the unauthorized possession of prohibited, modified, and loaded firearm magazines – particularly within the confines of a police vehicle – is a serious form of misconduct. Police Officers are entrusted to enforce the law, however being found guilty of breaching those very laws is inherently a serious matter.

The prosecution notes that there was no allegation that the magazines were ever utilized in Constable Konwerski's service weapon. Rather, they were simply present in a bag in the trunk of his assigned police vehicle. Cst. Konwerski did have a valid Possession and Acquisition Licence (PAL) at the time of the event, and personally owned firearms, which were lawfully registered in his name. While the gun magazines were purchased legally, Constable Konwerski was aware that his modifications over capacity made them prohibited by law, and that he had no valid licence to possess them – either personally or professionally.

Cst. Konwerski was sentenced to a conditional discharge in the court proceeding after accepting fault and demonstrated contrition. Nonetheless, the Prosecution submits that is not a defence to misconduct, and is still to be treated as a conviction for that purpose.

#### **Public Interest / Damage to the Reputation of PRP**

Inspector Clair stated that Constable Konwerski's conduct might not have directly involved the public, having only been discovered by another officer during a routine cruiser check. Police officers are sworn to uphold the law, and protect public safety – to have an officer found breaking the law and compromising public safety is undeniably harmful to the public image and reputation of the PRP, and police officers generally.

Inspector Clair reiterated that Constable Konwerski's convictions are possession-based offences, and there is no allegation of actual use of the prohibited items. They were discovered inside of a closed bag in the trunk of a police cruiser, where they were unlikely to be located by anyone other than a fellow officer.

#### **Discipline History**

Cst. Konwerski has been with the Service since joining as a Cadet in December 2012, and has been a sworn member since May 2015. Cst. Konwerski has not been subject to any other formal disciplinary findings.

**Rehabilitative Potential**

Cst. Konwerski's rehabilitative potential includes a guilty plea, which is viewed as an acceptance of responsibility and expression of remorse. He identified himself to a supervisor as the owner of the bag in question the day after its discovery and promptly took responsibility for the bag and its contents.

Constable Konwerski subsequently pleaded guilty in criminal court, and expressed remorse.

He has pleaded guilty in these proceedings, taken full responsibility for his actions, has demonstrated remorse and has carried on working without issue in the intermediary.

Inspector Clair opined that these swift guilty pleas are a significant mitigating factor.

**Deterrence**

Both general and specific deterrence are important factors in this case.

With respect to deterrence, Inspector Clair stated the importance of the penalty to act as a reminder to Cst. Konwerski of the gravity of his actions, particularly in light of his role as a police officer.

The penalty should also serve as a reminder to other members of the Service that criminal conduct is always serious misconduct, regardless of whether the complaint initiates internally or externally, and will be penalized accordingly.

**Consistency of Disposition**

Inspector Clair submitted that, in addition to the above-noted factors, the consistency of disposition should be considered when determining the appropriate penalty. As such, the Hearing Officer should look to similar cases for guidance.

The Prosecution put forward three previous Peel Regional Police discipline cases for reference:

1. PRP and Cst. D.M. (2017) – where the officer was charged by the OPP with six counts of unsafe storage of a firearm and two counts of breach of firearms regulations after responding to a domestic call. Police located a handgun in a kitchen drawer with ammunition readily available. There were also two young children in the home.

Cst. D.M. was subsequently charged with three counts of Discreditable Conduct (PSA).

Cst. D.M. had no discipline history and pleaded guilty to both the criminal and PSA charges. He received a penalty of reduction in rank from First Class Constable to Second Class Constable for a period of three months.

2. PRP and Cst. M.G. (2015) – where the officer was charged with assault after striking his spouse and a bystander while intoxicated at a wedding.

Cst. M.G. was subsequently charged with one count of Discreditable Conduct (PSA).

Cst. M.G. had no discipline history and pleaded guilty to both the criminal and PSA charges. He received a penalty of reduction in rank from First Class Constable to Second Class Constable for a period of four months.

3. PRP and Cst. M.M. (2008) – where the officer was charged with Mischief after consuming alcoholic drinks at a bar while off-duty and subsequently operating a motor vehicle that crashed into the rear of another vehicle at the side of the road. Cst. M.M left the scene and returned to his residence.

Cst. M.M. was subsequently charged with one count of Discreditable Conduct (PSA).

Cst. M.M. had no discipline history and pleaded guilty to both the criminal and PSA charges. He received a penalty of reduction in rank from First Class Constable to Second Class Constable for a period of three months.

Inspector Clair proposed that although there is no factually comparable precedent to refer in this matter, there is authority to impose a comparable demotion following a related criminal conviction.

Case #1 (PRP and Cst. D.M.) is the most similar to the facts presented in this matter, namely;

- Firearm-related criminal convictions had been entered, and a 12 month conditional discharge with conditions had been received
- The officer had a similar length of employment with the Service, and had no formal disciplinary history.
- Guilty pleas were entered to both the criminal and PSA charges.
- Most of the same aggravating and mitigating factors were present.

Case #2 (PRP and Cst. M.G.) involved intoxication and two allegations of assault. Factually, the two cases are unrelated. However, the related criminal conviction with a similar disposition, lack of formal disciplinary history, early criminal and PSA pleas, and PSA disposition (4-month demotion) are instructive.

Case #3 (PRP and M.M.) involved intoxication, driving under the influence, failure to remain, and mischief. Cst. Murray pled guilty to a criminal charge of mischief. Factually, the two cases are unrelated. However, the related criminal conviction with a similar disposition (a conditional discharge with 12 months probation), lack of formal disciplinary history, early criminal and PSA pleas, and PSA disposition (3-month demotion) are instructive.

This matter is somewhat dated, and is arguably a case where the aggravating factors would result in a more significant punishment being sought today.

Inspector Clair concluded his submissions with a request for demotion of a period similar to the cited cases.

In light of the fact that there was a criminal conviction and the charges are firearm-related, a reprimand would be inappropriate to denounce the seriousness of the conduct and the damage to the reputation of the police force. However, given the mitigating factors – including the ability to rehabilitate, and the recognition of the seriousness of the misconduct and entering early guilty pleas, the Prosecution proposed a penalty of a reduction in rank from First Class Constable to Second Class Constable for a period of 3 months.

## **Defence – Member Representative Mr. Pierre Bernard**

Mr. Pierre Bernard, Member Representative for the Peel Regional Police Association, spoke on behalf of the officer and submitted that Constable Konwerski accepted full responsibility for the charge of Discreditable Conduct by entering a guilty plea and that his misconduct is accurately summarized in the Agreed Statement of Facts. Constable Konwerski also agrees with the penalty that was proposed by the Prosecution and the Association.

Mr. Bernard referenced the case of *Krug and the Ottawa Police Service* (OCCPS – 2003), highlighting the following key factors to be considered by the Tribunal towards penalty:

### **Handicap and Other Relevant Personal Circumstances**

Mr. Bernard emphasized that the reasons that led to the misconduct are not offered as an excuse or to diminish responsibility. Rather, they should be considered when determining the appropriateness of the proposed penalty.

Constable Konwerski learned through his own research that police officers carry some additional non-issued equipment in an extra bag. These were non use-of-force items that may be needed in case of an emergency of some sort or in an unusual event.

In June 2016, Constable Konwerski attended a call that resulted in active shooter incident and where one officer had been required to reload his service weapon during the exchange of gunfire. As a result, he started to research articles and videos on police shooting events, including one incident where an officer used all of his ammunition in a shooting situation, as well as a 2018 mass shooting incident in Toronto. This raised Constable Konwerski's concern about responding to an active shooter call and that the basic three (3) issued magazines might not be sufficient in such situations.

It is for these reasons that Constable Konwerski modified two legally acquired rifle magazines to carry a full load of thirty (30) rounds instead of their legal five (5) rounds capacity limit, and which are compatible with the Service issued rifles. He also modified a pistol magazine to hold fifteen (15) .40 caliber rounds instead of the legal ten (10) rounds capacity.

Constable Konwerski started to carry these additional loaded magazines in a bag along with other non-Service issued equipment and supplies. The bag was locked in the trunk of the cruiser when Constable Konwerski was on patrol. This made him feel safer and better equipped to deal with potential shooter situations.

Constable Konwerski now recognizes that the use of non-issued magazines or ammunition in any shooting incident would be scrutinized agencies such as the SIU and that liability and serious harm could have been done to the reputation of the Service. Although he sincerely thought he was doing the right thing, he now realizes and accepts that his actions were ill advised. The process of being investigated by Internal Affairs, arrested and charged criminally along with the legal costs, damage to his work reputation and misconduct charge have been painful lessons for him.

### **Recognition of the Seriousness of the Misconduct**

Upon learning that another officer had discovered the bag he had forgotten in his cruiser, Constable Konwerski approached his Staff Sergeant to claim ownership. He subsequently pled guilty to three criminal charges of possessing a prohibited device. He was cooperative with Internal Affairs and gave a complete account of how he came to be in possession of these devices and of his reasons for having

them. He has taken full responsibility for it by pleading guilty to the resulting charge of Discreditable Conduct.

**Employment History**

Constable Konwerski was hired as a Cadet in December 2012. He received consistently positive evaluations which led to an offer of a position as a Constable in 2015. During his training at the Ontario Police College, Constable Konwerski was commended for his role as a member of the silent drill team. He was also commended for volunteering to replace another Recruit as the Student Duty Officer.

As a Constable at 21 Division, he was promoted through the ranks to 1<sup>st</sup> Class after consistently receiving positive performance evaluations. The only blemish on his file was in 2018 due to notetaking and administrative tasks. Mr. Bernard submitted several positive references from both commendations and performance evaluations.

**Potential to Reform or Rehabilitate**

Mr. Bernard submitted that Constable Konwerski is a Member who is a great candidate for rehabilitation by moving forward in a positive way and continue being the productive officer. Constable Konwerski was never suspended and despite the significant stress of this matter on him, he continued to perform his duties with a positive attitude with an unlikely chance of the misconduct being repeated.

**Consistency of Disposition**

Mr. Bernard submitted eight Peel Regional Police PSA matters to be considered by the Tribunal towards a disposition. All the PRP matters include similar circumstances of a guilty plea to both criminal and PSA charges and resulted in a relatively short period of demotion (3 months), which Mr. Bernard feels is appropriate in this matter.

**Specific and General Deterrence**

Mr. Bernard submits that the jointly proposed penalty of 3 months demotion does address both the specific and general deterrence that are required in this matter.

With respect to specific deterrence, the proposed penalty's penalty will have a financial impact on Constable Konwerski through approximately \$5,200 in lost salary. It will also make him ineligible for promotion for a minimum period of five (5) years, which translates into lost economic and career opportunities.

With respect to general deterrence, Mr. Bernard proposes that a demotion is the most serious penalty available short of termination, and that it sends a clear message to other officers that this type of misconduct is serious and that it has serious consequences. At the same time, the proposed penalty recognizes Constable Konwerski's admission and guilty pleas on both the criminal charges PSA charges.

**Damage to the Reputation of the Service**

The Defence submitted that no members of the public were interviewed by Internal Affairs in this matter. There was however, potential damage to the reputation of the Service in the eyes of court personnel involved in the processing of the charges and with the members of the judiciary involved in the trial. Further, PRP issued a media release and the story was reported in newspapers and online media outlets, resulting in some damage to the reputation of the Service and to the police profession in general.

Mr. Bernard is of the opinion that it “*would be unfair to put this entirely on Constable Konwerski's shoulders. It is the Service, after all, who chooses to do a media release by policy.*” Although he understands that it was done in the name of transparency, he questions if it was truly necessary. This question is predicated on the practice that the Service does not issue a media release when a Member is charged by another agency. Rather, the other agency would release a statement.

The Defence views the Service's choice to put out a media release is what precipitates damage to its reputation, and that damage should not be wholly attributed to the Members and their misconduct. Nonetheless, Defence that the PRP's image and reputation were likely tarnished by Constable Konwerski's misconduct.

### **Conclusion**

Mr. Bernard concluded Defence submissions that Constable Konwerski's personnel file and employment history describe an officer with excellent potential that has now been set back by ill-advised decision-making. Mr. Bernard asked that the Tribunal keep in mind Constable Konwerski's honesty and integrity are not put into question as a result of the misconduct in this matter.

## **PART III: DISCUSSION**

The Tribunal must review and consider the information that is included in the Agreed Statement of Facts along with the submissions made by the Prosecution and Defence, which lists factors to consider when determining the appropriate penalty.

The case of *Krug and the Ottawa Police Service (OCCPS, 2003)* addresses the aggravating and mitigating factors to consider when determining the penalty. The factors that I find relevant to focus on in assessing the misconduct of Constable Konwerski are as follows:

- Seriousness of the Misconduct
- Recognition of the seriousness of the misconduct
- Employment history
- Need for deterrence
- Damage to the Reputation of the Police Service
- Handicap and other relevant personal circumstances

It has been clearly established that misconduct was committed by Constable Konwerski.

On July 28, 2021, Constable Konwerski was found guilty of three (3) counts of Unauthorized Possession of a Prohibited Device contrary to s. 88(1) of the *Criminal Code of Canada* by the Honourable Justice S. Caponecchia in the Ontario Court of Justice in the City of Brampton. This was the result of an incident which occurred on or about September 21, 2019, whereby he left his backpack in the trunk of his police cruiser (#30). On September 28, 2019, cruiser checks were conducted at which time the backpack was located in cruiser #30 and found to contain two prohibited rifle magazines and one prohibited handgun magazine.

Constable Konwerski was given a conditional discharge and was placed on a Probation Order for twelve (12) months with conditions including reporting to a probation officer, perform community service and pay a victim surcharge.

### **Seriousness of the misconduct**

Police officers are held to a higher standard of ethical and moral character. In fact, these qualities are at the core of the police recruitment and selection process, and successful candidates are expected to maintain them throughout their careers.

Constable Konwerski's misconduct is a breach of the *Code of Conduct* that resulted in criminal charges and subsequent appearance before this Tribunal. The illegal possession of prohibited magazines intended for use in service-issued firearms during an active shooter incident is a serious departure of expected conduct. The Service provides police officers with the appropriate training and equipment required to effectively respond to dangerous situations while protecting themselves and members of the public. Further, Peel Region is a densely populated urban centre with a large police service and ample number of officers and specialized units that are available to quickly support one another in active shooter incidents. The rationale to justify individual officers possessing additional firepower is not only weak, but also erodes the expected standards of police operation that the community expects.

### **Recognition of the seriousness of the misconduct**

Constable Konwerski pled guilty at the criminal proceeding and during the *Police Services Act* hearing. Through Mr. Bernard's submissions and his own statement to the Tribunal, Constable Konwerski apologized for his actions and concurred with the Prosecution's submissions.

### **Employment history**

Constable Konwerski has been a member of the Service for 10 years. With the exception of a performance review related to his notetaking and administrative tasks in 2018, Constable Konwerski has conducted himself appropriately throughout his career.

The Tribunal recognizes this factor in determining penalty.

### **Need for deterrence**

Constable Konwerski, through his early guilty plea, has demonstrated that he understands the seriousness of his misconduct. His acceptance of responsibility includes an expectation of financial impact that is associated with both the legal fees and the proposed penalty.

In a general sense, this matter and resulting penalty will act as a reminder to officers of the expectation to abide by the high standards of the Service with respect to issued equipment. It also demonstrates to the community that the Service will ensure that officers abide by the high standards of conduct that the community expects.

### **Damage to the reputation of the police service**

It is quite clear that the reputation of any police service is shaped and impacted by the conduct of its members. The Tribunal's earlier statement regarding the community's expectation that police officers abide by the Service's high standards can be revisited here. The Service, through a broad public relations outreach strategy and through the actions of its members, endeavors daily to build and maintain the community's trust and confidence.

Constable Konwerski's misconduct was identified and addressed within a police facility and prior to posing

any external risk to the organization. Nonetheless, and in the interest of transparency, the Service issued a media release which resulted in awareness amongst local media and the public. In its submission, the Defence questions the necessity of the Service to issue a news release of the criminal charges and that it is this practice that elevates the risk of damage to its reputation. It is my view however, that damage to the reputation of the Service should not be measured by the level of public awareness of police misconduct, but rather by the fact that the misconduct occurred in the first place. The offences that are involved in this matter are serious and precisely those that are stringently enforced by police in order to ensure community safety.

### **Handicap and other relevant personal circumstances**

I would like to address Mr. Bernard's overview of Constable Konwerski's experiences which led to his research about active shooter incidents and subsequent modification of the magazines.

The Tribunal recognizes the inherent dangers that police officers face on a daily basis. Any individual who has donned a police uniform will likely experience the stress and uncertainty associated with active shooter or other critical incidents. It is clear that Constable Konwerski was impacted by the incident in 2016 and took measures to make him "*feel safer and better equipped to deal with such situations*".

The Tribunal recognizes Mr. Bernard's acknowledgement that Constable Konwerski did not share his concerns with anyone in his chain of command. It also recognizes that the Service provides robust programs through the Organizational Wellness Bureau, including Peer Support and a wide range of counselling services for members who experience such concerns.

## **PART IV: DISPOSITION**

Constable Konwerski's acceptance of responsibility by pleading guilty indicates that he appreciates the impact of his actions. I have reviewed all of the available information along with the submissions.

I accept that the shared position on penalty in this matter addresses both the specific and general deterrence requirements as articulated on page 11 of this decision.

### **PENALTY**

For the noted reasons, on one (1) count of Discreditable Conduct, as the Hearing Officer I impose on Constable Michael Konwerski #3798 of Peel Regional Police:

- a) A reduction in rank from 1<sup>st</sup> (First) Class Constable to 2<sup>nd</sup> (Second) Class Constable for a period of three (3) months, following which the officer will be returned to the rank of 1<sup>st</sup> (First) Class Constable on the basis of satisfactory work performance to be determined by the officer's Divisional Commander, and
- b) Perform any mandatory training as ordered by the Peel Regional Police



---

Superintendent Taufic Saliba #1796  
Peel Regional Police – Hearing Officer

May 10, 2022