

DECISION

File No. PC-25-0082

NOVA SCOTIA POLICE REVIEW BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF:

The *Police Act*, Chapter 31 of the *Acts* of 2004 and the Regulations made pursuant thereto

-and-

IN THE MATTER OF:

An appeal filed by **Yinong Cui**, Complainant, against **Cst. Shawn Grift & Cst. Brady Faulkner**, of the **Halifax Regional Police** requesting a review of a disciplinary decision made by Inspector Amit Parasram dated August 11th, 2025.

BEFORE:

Jean McKenna, Chair
Hon. Simon J. MacDonald, Vice-Chair
Siobhan Doyle, Board Member

COUNSEL:

Yinong Cui, Self-Represented
Brian Bailey, Counsel for Cst. Shawn Grift and Cst. Brady Faulkner
Andrew Gough, Counsel for Halifax Regional Police

HEARING DATE:

May 28th, 2026

DECISION DATE:

September 2nd, 2026

[1] This is the review of the complaint of Yinong Cui against Halifax Regional Police (HRP) Constables Brady Faulkner and Shaun Grift. The incident underlying the complaint occurred on May 7th, 2025, at the home of Mr. Cui on Regal Drive in Bedford. Mr. Cui's allegations fall within a violation of the Code of Conduct, 24(1)(e) - Abuse of authority (Being uncivil or discourteous to a member of the public), and 24(3)(a) – (Negligent investigation.)

[2] The background facts are that on May 7th, 2025, Tingli Wu called HRP, stating that her daughter's vehicle was in the Cui driveway on Ridge Valley Road; that it had been there in excess of a month, and that Mr. Cui was demanding payment for vehicle storage before he would release the keys to her.

[3] The audio of Ms. Wu's call to 911 was played and entered as an exhibit at the hearing. She was not called to testify.

[4] From the outset, this appeared to be a civil dispute between Ms. Wu and Mr. Cui.

[5] Constables Faulkner and Grift were dispatched to the address. The dispatch described "theft, attempted theft of a vehicle." Cst. Faulkner immediately contacted Ms. Wu directly, and she clarified her details of the situation. She alleged that Mr. Cui had offered to repair her daughter's vehicle. He had instructed her to drop it off at his driveway, which she did, along with the keys and charging cable. This was in March 2025. She said that the vehicle was not repaired, and that she wanted to retrieve the vehicle. She said that Mr. Cui now wanted \$2600.00 in storage fees, and he was refusing to turn over her keys, the charger, and the vehicle.

[6] The officers confirmed registered ownership of the vehicle.

[7] The officers treated the matter as an “assist citizen”, rather than theft. This meant that the purpose of their presence was to keep the peace while Ms. Wu made the final arrangements to have the vehicle removed and delivered to a location of her choosing.

[8] When they arrived at the scene, Ms. Wu was not yet there, but arrived at some point in the interaction. She was advised to remain in her vehicle while they spoke to Mr. Cui.

[9] They knocked on the door, Mr. Cui answered. They explained to him that they were there to investigate a complaint of a possible theft of a vehicle. He was upset, said that he wanted the vehicle out of his driveway, but that she owed him money. He refused to hand over the keys and battery charger. He also wanted to speak with Ms. Wu directly. He slammed the door in their face.

[10] Following Ms. Wu’s arrival, Cst. Faulkner instructed her to remain in her car while he spoke to Mr. Cui. She left briefly, apparently wanting to use the washroom at the nearby Sunnyside Mall. She was told to return quickly, as she would need to be present to deal with the tow truck operator. (They had contacted a towing service towing on her behalf to speed up the process. This is a normal practice.) They were not having the vehicle seized. She would have to provide instructions to the tow truck operator, including desired destination for the vehicle, and arrange for payment.

[11] They repeatedly attempted to explain to Mr. Cui that this was a civil matter, but he continued to perceive that the officers were seizing the vehicle. He said that Ms. Wu owed him money in relation to a shared trip to Montreal.

[12] Mr. Cui then contacted HRP, wanting another officer to attend, as he said that he did not know if Cst’s. Grift and Faulkner were genuine HRP officers. He was angry that individuals

purporting to be police officers were at his home trying to seize a vehicle. The dispatcher that received the call rather angrily responded that officers were already there.

[13] Mr. Cui alleges that the officers were rude to him, that they damaged his door when they knocked, and that the removal of Ms. Wu's vehicle from the driveway damaged the pavement.

[14] Mr. Cui videoed portions of his interactions with Cst. Grift and Faulkner, and introduced them in evidence at the hearing. It depicts portions of his conversations with both officers. Mr. Cui can be heard, and is clearly angry and upset. Both officers calmly and repeatedly explain to Mr. Cui that they were there simply to "keep the peace" while Ms. Wu has her vehicle removed. Throughout the video, Mr. Cui does not appear to listen to the explanation, and continuously speaks over them.

[15] Staff Sgt. Carmichael, shift supervisor, was dispatched to the scene, as he had been advised that there was a dispute. He spoke to Mr. Cui, to get his version of events. He tried to explain to Mr. Cui that the owner was coming to retrieve the vehicle, and that the officers were there simply to keep the peace. He testified that Mr. Cui was perhaps upset, more than angry, but as was the case with Cst's. Grift and Faulkner, Mr. Cui cut off any attempt by Staff Sgt. Carmichael to explain.

[16] Mr. Cui continuously claimed that Ms. Wu owed him money, and he believed that he was entitled to keep the car until he was paid.

[17] Mr. Cui states in his closing submissions that the vehicle had been there since January 2025, and was preventing him from moving his own vehicle. In his submissions, he attached 2 screenshots depicting a grey vehicle in his driveway. They appear to be images from a doorbell cam of some sort. The first is allegedly dated March 13th, 2025, the second, on May 7th, 2025,

with the tow truck in the process of removing Ms. Wu's vehicle. (The photos were not introduced as evidence in the course of the hearing and Cst. Grift testified in cross examination of Mr. Cui that he did not observe any other vehicle in the driveway on May 7th, 2025, although the later photograph certainly must be taken at the time of the May 7th vehicle removal, as the tow truck is present).

[18] Regardless, these photographs were not in evidence before the Board. The Board often gives some latitude to lay witnesses, but we will not go so far as to allow evidence after the fact. In any event, even if the Board was to consider them, the driveway appears to be at least 2 cars wide, and the photos don't support the suggestion in Mr. Cui's argument that Ms. Wu's Vehicle was "...obstructing my normal use of my property". As Mr. Cui had the keys to the vehicle, and a charger, it seems highly unlikely that it had been blocking access to his own vehicle since January. It also does not impact the credibility of either of the Constables; the location of another vehicle in the driveway is not of a nature to undermine credibility. As well, that does not alter the fact that this conflict between Ms. Wu and Mr. Cui was civil in nature. If the Wu vehicle was blocking access by his own vehicle, that it something to be determined in a civil forum, such as Small Claims Court.

[19] In his closing submissions, Mr. Cui made many allegations. He states that "Cst. Faulkner testified that he had initially intended to recommend criminal charges related to theft... but that Ms. Wu declined to pursue those allegations, and the respondents therefore abandoned those recommendations". That assertion is false, and possibly, attributable to the fact that English is not Mr. Cui's first language, (although his lengthy written submission is very articulate and organized). Cst. Faulkner in his evidence said that he initially told Cui that they were investigation a complaint of possible theft and extortion.

[20] Cst. Faulkner also said that Mr. Cui had been eating, and that when he spoke to him at the door, he was spitting food. Cst. Faulkner testified in response “that’s disgusting”. That hardly rises to the level of discourtesy, it seems more of a natural reaction to the incident.

[21] Mr. Cui simply remains convinced that the officers required an order of some sort to remove the vehicle. He refuses to accept the fact that the officers did not remove the vehicle.

[22] Mr. Cui in his lengthy submissions characterizes the officer’s conduct as resolution of a civil dispute. He states that “...when a dispute becomes civil, the proper forum is the civil courts – not police enforcement”. He repeatedly ignores the fact that the officers were not there to resolve a civil dispute, nor did they. They were there to keep the peace, which they did. They testified that their encounter with Mr. Cui indicated to them that Ms. Wu had reason to be fearful of direct interaction with Mr. Cui.

[23] Whether the civil dispute was ever resolved is unknown.

[24] Police officers are often called upon to be present in civil interactions where parties are in conflict, and or confrontation, such as public demonstrations, landlord tenant relationships, domestic disputes over recovery of shared property, etc. That was the rationale for their attendance in this case. The video evidence presented by Mr. Cui himself, demonstrates that they remained calm and courteous, despite dealing with a very agitated Mr. Cu. We cannot accept that the knock on the door, however loud, could possibly have done any damage to his front door, without doing significant damage to the hand of the officer. We have no concern with their credibility.

[25] The Board finds that Constables Grift and Faulkner were clearly not in breach of the Code of Conduct. The complaint is dismissed.

Dated in Halifax, Nova Scotia this 2nd day of September, 2026.

ORIGINAL SIGNED

Jean McKenna, Chair

ORIGINAL SIGNED

Hon. Simon MacDonald, Vice-Chair

ORIGINAL SIGNED

Siobhan Doyle, Member