ALBERTA EXAMPLES

Case #1:

On 23 September 2000, a multi-million dollar break and enter and arson occurred in **Edmonton** . The complainant, Derrick Concrete, lost an entire building and a great amount of tools. There were no suspects and after extensive investigation the file was suspended. On 31 October 2001 we received a CPIC hit, via the BWI Automated Reporting System, indicating a Milwaukee chop saw, that was stolen from the complainant's B/E & Arson, had been pawned at a **Calgary pawn shop** on 29 October 2001. The complainant positively identified the pawned chop saw by serial number and special markings. The pawner was identified, by the complainant, as an ex-employee of Derrick Concrete, and had been fired some time prior to the fire. The information was forwarded to the original Arson investigator. This was the first break in this case he had. The complainant's chop saw had been stolen in Edmonton and pawned in Calgary.

Without the cross jurisdictional sharing of transaction information, supplied by the Automated Reporting System, this lead may never have surfaced.

Case #2:

On 25 August 2001, a suspect was arrested, in **Edmonton**, driving a stolen truck. Stolen property from **Fort Saskatchewan** was found in the truck. We found the truck had also been stolen from the same B/E. We queried the suspects name on the BWI Automated Reporting System and found he had pawned (2) two stereo components at two different **Edmonton pawn shops** on 17 August 2001. Investigation found these stereo components had been stolen from a residential break and enter in **Stony Plain** the same day the suspect pawned them, 17 August 2001. The suspect was charged with the Fort Saskatchewan B/E and the Stony Plain B/E.

Due to the "real time" transaction input of the BWI Automated Reporting System we were able to link this suspect to the Stony Plain B/E immediately upon his initial arrest. Under our existing "hard copy" transaction input system we would not have known of the suspects link to the Stony Plain B/E for 3-4 weeks. The Stony Plain complainant's property was returned to them and a suspect charged with the offence within 8 days of the crime.

Case #3:

A residential break and enter occurred in **Edmonton** on 07 January 2002. No suspects were identified. A follow-up detective received the file on 10 January 2002 and queried the complainant's stolen property on the BWI Automated Reporting System. He immediately found some of the complainant's property had been pawned at an **Edmonton pawn shop**, the same day the B/E occurred. Through the transaction information a suspect was identified and was arrested on 11January 2002. Further investigation and interview, of the suspect, made possible the return of most of the complainant's stolen property.

Because of the “real time” feature of the BWI Automated Reporting System a suspect was identified, arrested and the complainant’s property was returned within 4 days of the crime occurring. Under our existing “hard copy” transaction input system this timely manner of solving a crime and arresting a suspect is unheard-of.

Case #4:

A residential break and enter occurred in **Edmonton** on 08 February 2002 . No suspects were identified. A follow-up detective queried the complainant’s stolen property on the BWI Automated Reporting System on 10 February 2002 and found some of the complainant’s property had been pawned at an **Edmonton pawn shop** the same day the B/E occurred. The pawner (suspect) was identified through the transaction information and was arrested on 12 February 2002, thus ending his crime spree. The suspect’s pawn transaction history showed he had pawned a substantial amount of property between 24 January 2002 and 08 February 2002. Through investigation into this pawned property (5) five other break and enters, that occurred between 24 January 2002 and 31 January 2002 in one apartment complex, were solved, the property recovered and returned to it’s rightful owners. Further investigation linked some of the suspects pawned property to another B/E that occurred on 05 February 2002. This property was also returned to it’s owner. At the end of the investigation (7) seven break and enters had been solved, 3 other suspects had been identified, arrested and charged and most of the stolen property from the break and enters and been returned to it’s owners.

Had the pawn shop where the suspect pawned stolen property on 24 January 2002 been submitting it’s transaction information through an Automated Reporting System, the suspect may have been detected within days of this pawn and arrested. This would have prevented the B/E’s the suspect committed on 05 & 08 February 2002 from occurring.

This case is a perfect example of justification for all pawn shops and second hand stores to be reporting on one Automated Reporting System as it shows how timely detection could have prevented 2 B/E’s.

Case #5:

Between September 2000 and March 2001 Revy stores in Southern Saskatchewan and Southern Alberta, including **Calgary,** found they were missing in excess of $10,000 in tools. They felt this was an internal theft by some employee. In March 2001 the serial numbers from the stolen tools were entered on CPIC which immediately generated a “hit” through the BWI Automated Reporting System. A suspect had pawned one of the complainant’s stolen tools in a pawn shop in Regina on 11 November 2000. This tool had originated from Calgary’s Revy.

This particular **Regina store** was reporting it’s transactions via the BWI system. Identification of the suspect showed he was a sales representative for Revy, Southern Sask. and Southern Alberta area. The time delay occurred from the complainant not realizing any thefts had occurred for 7 months.

The Automated Reporting System was responsible for identifying a suspect to the Calgary investigator even though the pawn had occurred in Regina.

Case #6:

A residential break and enter occurred in **Calgary** on 06 May 2001. 250 CD's and 90 DVD's were stolen from the complainant. Follow-up investigation found that a suspect had sold 36 DVD's at a Calgary used CD store the day of the complainant's B/E. Within an hour the same suspect sold 40 more DVD's and 60 CD's to another Calgary store. These CD's and DVD's were identified by the complainant as belonging to him. A query of the suspect's name on the BWI Automated Reporting System revealed the suspect had pawned 111 CD's, 11 May 2001, at a **pawn shop in Ottawa**, **Ontario**, and another 19 CD's, 14 May 2001 also in **Ottawa**. Many of the titles of the Ottawa pawned CD's matched the complainant's stolen CD titles, but positive identification could not be made. The suspect could not be located and is still at large.

The Ottawa pawns were identified by the Calgary investigator through the BWI Automated Reporting System.

Case #7:

A residential break and enter occurred in **Calgary** between 08 May 2001 and 11 May 2001. Jewelry and hockey cards were stolen from the complainant. A possible suspect was identified by the complainant. The suspect's name was queried on the BWI Automated Reporting System and the investigator found the suspect had pawned a watch at a **Calgary pawn shop** on 10 May 2001. This watch was identified by the complainant as belonging to him. The Calgary pawn shop owner informed the police investigator the suspect also wanted to pawn a large quantity of hockey cards but he refused to take them. Information on the resolution of this case is not known.

Due to the "real-time" transaction data capture feature of the BWI Automated Reporting System the complainant's watch was returned to him within days of his B/E and the complainant's suspect was confirmed.

Case #8:

A Gas powered generator was stolen from a Yamaha dealership in **Kelowna, B.C.** on
11 November 2001. A suspect was identified by the complainant but could not be located in Kelowna. Kelowna pawn shops were checked but the generator could not be located. The generator's serial number was listed on CPIC. On 10 December 2001 I received a CPIC hit indicating the generator stolen from Kelowna had been pawned at a local **Edmonton pawn shop**, on 14 November 2001, by the suspect the complainant had listed. The suspect could not be located in Edmonton at that time. Later information found he had traveled to Winnipeg a few days after pawning the generator. The generator was recovered and returned to the complainant and a warrant issued for the suspect.

Due to the pawn shop submitting "hard copy" transactions and the generator transaction not being entered into the EPS computer data base (Probe), there was approximately a one month delay before police received a CPIC hit on the generator.

Had this pawn shop been entering his transaction information on an Automated Reporting System a CPIC hit would have been received by police one to two days after the suspect pawned the generator. If detection had been that timely the suspect may have been apprehended in Edmonton rather than still being at large, committing more crimes.

The suspect was arrested, in February 2002, on outstanding warrants in Edmonton. It was found the suspect had committed numerous crimes in his travels between Edmonton and Winnipeg, between November 2001 and February 2002. Had the pawned generator been detected earlier these crimes may have been prevented.

Case #9:

A residential break and enter occurred in **Beaverlodge, AB** in February 2002. The Beaverlodge RCMP detachment notified the Grande Prairie RCMP of the crime and asked they be on the look out for the complainant's property in the **Grand Prairie pawn shops** or second hand stores. Grande Prairie RCMP attended their local stores and found suspects had attended one store attempting to sell some of the complainant's property. The store refused to purchase the articles but obtained the names of the suspects. With this information the Grande Prairie RCMP were able to arrest the suspects and return the complainant's property.

This example shows the cross jurisdictional movement of criminal to avoid detection. The town of Beaverlodge has 1 pawnshop, yet the suspect chose to try and pawn their stolen articles in Grande Prairie.

Case #10:

A well site near **Spirit River** was broken into and property stolen, in October 2001. Investigation found that the property was pawned in a local **Grande Prairie pawn shop**.

Another example of cross jurisdictional movement of criminals and stolen property.

Case #11:

A camera had been stolen from a residence in **Saskatoon, SK.**, on 06 September 2000. After manually entering Calgary pawn transaction information into the Calgary computer (PIRS), Calgary police received a CPIC hit concerning the camera on 21 December 2000, almost 3 months after the theft. The camera had been pawned at a **Calgary pawn shop** on 21 September 2000. The pawned camera was positively identified by the Saskatoon complainant and returned to him. A warrant was issued for the suspect.

Saskatoon police have access to the BWI transaction data base. Had the Calgary pawn shop been reporting their transaction via the BWI Automated Reporting System, Saskatoon police would have received a CPIC hit on the camera within days of it being pawned in Calgary, on 21 September 2000. At that time, rather than 3 months later, chances of apprehending the suspect would have been much greater.

Case #12

A residential break and enter occurred in **Morley, AB** and a television and VCR were stolen. Through investigation, it was found the television and VCR were pawned at a **Calgary pawn shop** by a local Morley resident. The woman was subsequently charged and the property returned to the complainant. (cross jurisdictional movement)

Case #13:

A joint operation was created between the Calgary Police and surrounding RCMP Detachments regarding subjects pawning articles in Calgary that were stolen from outside jurisdictions. The two police agencies were manually sharing pawn transaction information from each jurisdictions. It was found a theft had occurred in **Cochrane** and the property was pawned at a pawn shop in **Calgary**.

Cochrane and Calgary both have pawnshops in their jurisdictions. Had the stores in these jurisdictions been reporting their transactions through an Automated Reporting System, both police agencies would have been able to access all the pawn transactions through a computer rather than manually comparing records and names.

Case #14:

A theft of two air nailers occurred in **Cochrane**. Subsequent investigations found the nailers had been pawned by a suspect in a **Calgary pawn shop,** the same day as the theft. The suspect was arrested and the property returned to the complainant.

The suspect could have pawned the nailers in Cochrane but chose to go to another jurisdiction to pawn them so as to avoid detection.

Case #15:

A car was broken into in **Moose Jaw, SK.** And the stereo from it was stolen. Approximately 6 weeks later, through a CPIC hit, police found the stereo had been pawned in a **Calgary pawn shop** a short time after it was stolen. Through investigation the police found the pawner had an extensive history of interaction with various Police Agencies west of Ontario. The suspect could not be located and a warrant was issued for his arrest. The stereo was recovered and returned to it's owner.

Had the Calgary pawn shops been reporting their transactions on an Automated Reporting System, Moose Jaw police could have located the stereo shortly after it was stolen.

Case #16:

Three commercial break and enters occurred in **Fernie, BC.** Sometime later, through a CPIC hit, a digital camera stolen from one of the B/E's was found to have been pawned at a **Calgary pawn shop**. The suspect was identified, which led to the discovery of other property stolen from the Fernie B/E's. The suspect was charged and property returned to the owners.

This is an example of the cross jurisdictional movement of stolen property.

Case #17:

A $1200.00 BMW bike was stolen from a car wash in **Acme, AB.** Information gained from an informant found the bike had been pawned in a **Calgary pawn shop**. The bike was returned to it's owner and a suspect was identified through the transaction information.

Again, this shows the cross jurisdictional movement of stolen property.

Case #18:

A Fender guitar was stolen from residence in **Morley, AB.** A CPIC hit through the BWI Automated Reporting System showed this guitar had been pawned at a **Calgary pawn shop** the same day it was stolen. The guitar was returned to the complainant, a suspect identified and arrested with a few days of the pawn. Due to the "real-time" feature of the BWI Automated Reporting System.

Due to the timely discovery of the stolen property the suspect's crime spree was abruptly ended.

Case #19:

A vehicle was broken into in **Ardrie, AB.** On 06 June 2001. A subwoofer and two Sony Amplifiers were stolen. The complainant located his stolen property in a **Calgary pawn shop** on
24 September 2001, 3 months after the theft. By the time Calgary Police received information from the complainant, concerning his find, and attended the pawn shop, the articles had been sold by the store. Investigation revealed the suspect had pawned the complainant's stolen property 2 days after the theft.

Because of the delay of the "hard-copy" transaction input of this pawn shops pawn sheets, the complainant's stolen property was not located in time to recover it for him. Had this pawn shop been reporting his transaction on an Automated Reporting System property would have been located within days of the pawn transaction and returned to him. The suspect would have been identified immediately and brought to justice. Due to antiquated tools the police have to work with, this complainant lost his property twice due to untimeliness.

Case #20:

A vehicle was broken into in **Lethbridge**, on 15 June 2001 and a camera was stolen. A CPIC hit through the BWI Automated Reporting System indicated the camera had been pawned at a **Calgary pawn shop** hours after the theft in Lethbridge. A suspect was identified and the camera returned to the complainant within a few days of the theft.

This is a very good example of the benefits of the timely detection of the stolen camera and the subsequent arrest of a suspect and return of the stolen property to the owner. It also shows the cross jurisdictional movement of criminals to avoid detection. Lethbridge has pawn shops and second hand stores the suspect could have pawned the camera at, but he chose to go to Calgary to do so.

Case #21:

Numerous break and enters occurred in **High River, AB.** The RCMP sent a request to Calgary Police to assist in trying to locate the property, possibly in the Calgary pawn shops or second hand stores. A Calgary investigator queried the stolen property on the BWI Automated Reporting System and found that some of the property had been pawned at 2 different **pawn shops in Calgary**. A suspect was identified and the complainant's property was retrieved for them, within a short time of the B/E's.

Again, this example show the importance of timely discovery of stolen property in the pawn shops and second hand stores, available through an Automated Reporting Registry System. It also shows criminals committing crime in one jurisdiction and disposing of the stolen goods in another.

Case #22:

A residential break and enter occurred in **Bragg Creek, AB.** and a VCR was stolen. Through a CPIC hit, police found the VCR had been pawned in a **Calgary pawn shop**. A suspect was identified and the VCR returned to it's owner.

The time frame for this occurrence is not known, but it again shows the cross jurisdictional movement of stolen property and criminals.

Case #23:

A construction trailer was broken into in **Edmonton**, on 12 February 2002 and $4000.00 in tools were stolen. Unfortunately the tools were not entered on CPIC data base until 22 March 2002 On 24 March 2002 I received a call from a Calgary investigator stating he had received a CPIC hit on the BWI Automated Reporting System indicating 2 Englo compressors, stolen from the complainant's trailer, had been pawned at a **Calgary pawn shop** on 19February 2002. A suspect was identified through this Calgary pawn. Queries of the suspect's name on the Edmonton pawn data base showed he had also pawned 2 nailers at an **Edmonton pawn shop** on 12 February 2002, the day of the theft. The complainant positively identified the compressors and nailers as being stolen from his construction trailer. This investigation is still on-going.

The suspect obviously committed the theft and pawned some of the property in an Edmonton pawn shop, the same day as the theft. He then made his way to Calgary and pawned more of the stolen property in a Calgary pawn shop. Due to information and intelligence sharing, the BWI Automated Reporting System, the Calgary investigator and myself were able to work together on this file to recover the property for the complainant and bring the criminal to justice. The delay which occurred in this case was the late CPIC entry of the complainant's stolen property. Had this property been entered immediately after the theft we could have located the complainant's compressors within days of his theft.

Case #24:

A residential break and enter occurred in **Bow Island, AB**, on 06 March 2002. No suspect was known. The RCMP investigator queried the stolen property on the BWI Automated Reporting System and found some of the property had been pawned at a **Medicine Hat pawn shop** and the rest of the property at a **pawn shop in Regina, Sask.,** within days of the break and enter. The property was recovered and returned to the owner and a suspect was identified.

This is an excellent example of cross jurisdictional information sharing the Automated Reporting System offers, and cross jurisdictional movement of stolen property. This suspect committed a crime in one jurisdiction and disposed of the stolen property in two separate jurisdictions. The property in Medicine Hat may eventually have been located through the old manual system, but the property pawned in Regina would undoubtedly never have been found.

Case Study #25:

A break and enter occurred in Edmonton on 16 April 2002. The complainant left his home at 8:30 am and returned at 11:20 am to find it had been broken into. The complainant learned, in the morning of 17 April 2002, through an anonymous person, that the person responsible for his break-in may be trying to pawn it at an unknown Edmonton pawn shop. The anonymous person contacted an Edmonton Detective and supplied the suspect's name. The suspect's name was queried on the BWI system and we found this suspect had pawned 90% of the complainant's stolen property at an Edmonton pawn shop at 9:41 am 16 April 2002, 70 minutes after the complainant left his home. The suspect was arrested and charged with committing this B/E, thus ending his crime spree.

Had it not been for the "real time" reporting feature of the BWI system, the property may not have been located in the pawn shop for 4-5 weeks, (delay time of entering pawn sheets into Edmonton data base) without physically searching the 85 stores in Edmonton.