

**FORM 301 - FEDERAL COURT OF CANADA IN THE MATTER OF AN
APPLICATION PURSUANT TO SECTION 18.1 OF THE *FEDERAL COURTS ACT*,
R.S.C. 1985, c. F-7**

BETWEEN:

DANA-LEE MELFI

Applicant

-and-

**THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA (Representing the Civilian Review and
Complaints Commission for the RCMP)**

Respondent

NOTICE OF APPLICATION

TO THE RESPONDENT:

A LEGAL PROCEEDING HAS BEEN COMMENCED BY THE APPLICANT. The relief claimed by the applicant appears on the following pages.

IF YOU WISH TO OPPOSE THIS APPLICATION, to receive notice of any step in the application or to be served with any documents, you or a lawyer acting for you must prepare a Notice of Appearance in Form 305, serve it on the applicant, and file it, with proof of service, in the registry of the Federal Court within ten (10) days after service of this Notice of Application.

I. APPLICATION

1. THE APPLICANT, DANA-LEE MELFI, MAKES APPLICATION FOR:

- a. **An Order in the nature of *Certiorari*** quashing the September 11, 2025 Notice of Direction (CRCC File 2025-3732) and the subsequent constructive refusal of the CRCC Chairperson to adjudicate formal Review File **R2025-009970**.
- b. **An Order in the nature of *Mandamus*** compelling the Chairperson of the Civilian Review and Complaints Commission (CRCC) to launch a complete investigation into the multi-docket document manipulation and execution of "ghost arrests" by Sergeant Mathieu Castonguay #57914.
- c. **A Declaration** that the Respondent acted in institutional bad faith, committed a severe abuse of process, and breached the principles of natural justice by ignoring formal review files, propagating verified false data, and establishing a circular jurisdictional loop designed to deny the Applicant his *Charter* rights.

II. THE GROUNDS FOR THIS APPLICATION ARE:

2. **Total Statutory Non-Response and Constructive Deferral Fraud:**

Following the initial decision of the Professional Responsibility Unit, the Applicant followed the exact legislative instructions provided under Part VII of the *RCMP Act*. On October 21, 2025, the Applicant formally submitted an application for an internal review, recorded as **CRCC Reference Number: R2025-009970 [Ex. 25]**.

3. Rather than reviewing the file or issuing a final statutory report as mandated by law, the Respondent has completely ignored the file, failing to provide any response or updates. The Applicant submits that this continuous failure to act constitutes an intentional administrative delay, a constructive refusal to adjudicate, and a bad-faith effort to deplete the Applicant's resources and run out strict statutory court timelines.

4. **Willful Blindness and Systematic Omission of Multi-Docket Evidence:**

The Respondent's screening process was built upon a deliberate omission of the evidentiary record. The Applicant formally served the Respondent's intake branch with comprehensive metadata, digital tracking logs, and case citations proving that document manipulation under Section 366 of the *Criminal Code* was a repeatable template deployed systematically across at least four distinct Ontario Court dockets: **#22-A8428**, **#22-A8408**, **#22-R15500**, and **#22-15609AP [Ex. 24]**. The Respondent formally acknowledged receipt of this evidence on August 18, 2025 [Ex. 24]. Yet, in their final September 11, 2025 Notice of Direction, the Respondent **willfully omitted every single reference to the multi-docket fraud**, failing to evaluate or address the core elements of a coordinated conspiracy to mislead the judiciary [Ex. 23].

5. **Engineering a Coordinated "Circular Referral" Jurisdictional Loop:**

The Respondent utilized its statutory screening powers under the *RCMP Act* to actively deny the Applicant access to justice. In the September 11, 2025 Notice of Direction, Inspector Alex Pettigrew commanded the Applicant to take his criminal corruption findings to the **Ottawa Police Service as the police of jurisdiction [Ex. 23]**. When the Applicant complied and opened OPS File **#25-299498 [Ex. 12]**, local police leadership immediately coordinated with provincial oversight (LECA) to summarily terminate the file within 48 hours under Section 72, claiming that because the subject officer was an RCMP member, local authorities lacked standing [Ex. 10]. By ordering an impoverished, self-represented citizen into a predetermined jurisdictional dead-end where federal and provincial agencies simply point back and forth at one another, the

Respondent actively participated in an administrative shell game to shield public officers from criminal liability.

6. **The Democracy Watch Jurisdictional Mandate over Gatekeeping**

Discretion:

The Respondent committed a reviewable error in law and an abuse of authority by misinterpreting its statutory gatekeeping powers and screening discretion under the guise of public interest. In strict alignment with the Supreme Court of Canada's ruling in ***Democracy Watch v. Canada (Attorney General)*, 2026 SCC 24**, administrative screening desks do not possess unreviewable discretion to insulate public bodies or shield systemic misconduct from accountability. The Supreme Court establishes that when an oversight body exercises a gatekeeping function, its decision must display a standard of justification, transparency, and intelligibility that directly aligns with the democratic purposes of its enabling legislation.

7. **Relying on and Propagating Verified False Information:**

The Respondent's entire review and final directive were built upon a foundation of false information generated by RCMP Command. The Respondent accepted the institutional position that Sergeant Mathieu Castonguay (#57914) was the legitimate, hands-on arresting officer on paper. In March 2026, a primary source Privacy Act disclosure under **RCMP File P-2025-01812** exposed this as a complete fabrication: Officer Castonguay's actual physical notebook pages explicitly state that **he was NOT the arresting officer**, but was merely handed an already-detained prisoner by an unidentified unit [Ex. 07]. An administrative oversight body cannot claim to have issued a valid, lawful decision if its entire factual baseline is built upon a verified forged state document that directly compromises the administration of justice under ***EPS v. McKee (2026 SCC 24)***.

8. **Constitutional Infringement of the Right to Full Disclosure:**

By closing the file based on fabricated records, mischaracterizing the text of the submission, deploying conflicting investigators, and failing to execute cross-agency data taskings, the Respondent violated the Applicant's rights under **Sections 7 and 11(d) of the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*** and directly breached the strict disclosure mandates outlined by the Supreme Court of Canada.

III. STATUTORY TIME CONSTRAINTS, INSTITUTIONAL DELAY, AND THE CONCEALMENT OF STATE MISCONDUCT

9. **Impossibility of Timely Compliance Due to State Interventions:**

The Applicant submits that strict compliance with standard statutory time limits for filing applications for judicial review and associated legal instruments has been rendered operationally and legally impossible due to a calculated, bad-faith campaign of administrative stonewalling, the fabrication of false final reports, improper ATIP closures, and the repeated summary rejection and electronic deletion of new complaints by the Respondents.

10. **The Deliberate Delay Matrix:**

The Respondents are fully aware that an impoverished, self-represented citizen faces significant systemic barriers when challenging multiple state organs simultaneously while subsisting on a fixed illness benefit of just \$733 per month [Ex. 03]. The Respondents have actively weaponized these financial and logistical constraints to deliberately delay proceedings and run out strict statutory deadlines:

- a. **a. Active Factual Concealment:** The true operational notebooks of the primary arresting unit (**Sgt. Mathieu Castonguay #57914**) were actively withheld by the state until they were finally forced out under an ATIP order on March 5, 2026 [Ex. 07]. This means the critical factual paradox proving that the state's entire court disclosure was built upon a forged record was hidden from the Applicant by the state until early 2026, making any earlier filing of these legal actions structurally impossible.
- b. **b. Purging of the Public Record:** The Law Enforcement Complaints Agency (LECA) actively executed the spoliation of public data by purging tracking files (such as Complaint E-202410211407481365) from the provincial Electronic Registry, returning a fraudulent "File Not Found" system result to electronic lookups as of July 25, 2026 [Ex. 11]. This digital erasure was executed specifically to break the accountability trail and block the Applicant's access to the courts.
- c. **c. Engineered Jurisdictional Loops:** The Civilian Review and Complaints Commission (CRCC) issued an explicit order on September 11, 2025, directing the Applicant to bring his files to the Ottawa Police Service (OPS) as the police of jurisdiction [Ex. 23]. When the Applicant complied, the OPS and LECA weaponized the filing to issue a summary screening shutdown within 48 hours [Ex. 10], while simultaneously deploying an unlawful \$5 application fee trap to block access to the physical camera grids capturing the arrest footprint [Ex. 19].

- d. **d. Total Statutory Non-Response:** The CRCC has completely ignored formal Review File **R2025-009970** since October 21, 2025 [Ex. 25], utilizing total silence as a mechanism to leave the Applicant stuck in an endless internal administrative loop.

11. Tolling of Deadlines Based on Ongoing Fraud and Special Circumstances:

The Applicant submits that under well-settled administrative and criminal law principles, statutory limitation periods do not run, and must be equitably tolled, where the underlying cause of action is actively concealed by the bad-faith, fraudulent actions of public authorities. The submission of falsified public arrest logs to the courts and Crown is a continuous, active offense that directly compromises the administration of justice under ***EPS v. McKee* (2026 SCC 24)**.

12. The Respondents cannot rely on statutory deadlines that they themselves engineered through active obstruction and data deletion. The Applicant has acted with complete diligence by methodically disseminating uncontradicted public notices [Ex. 18] and publishing extensive national investigative print features [Ex. 16, Ex. 17]. Equity and the interests of justice demand that these files be formally heard on their merits to prevent public officers from utilizing administrative delay to flee indictment and sabotage the Applicant's upcoming November 2026 civil discovery [Ex. 01].

The law states there is a deadline, but the Supreme Court of Canada in ***EPS v. McKee*** rules that the state cannot hide records of police misconduct. The state hid the true notebooks until March 2026, deleted the file trackers from the public system, and threatened to label the Applicant vexatious for showing them the fraud. They cannot use an administrative deadline that they manufactured through active obstruction to keep a crime from being seen by a judge.

IV. THE DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE TO BE USED AT THE HEARING:

13. The Applicant intends to rely upon the following materials at the hearing of this application:

- a. **a.** The Affidavit of the Applicant, Dana-Lee Melfi, detailing the portal formatting constraints, the chronology of the public notices, and the structural refusal of the private bar to accept his Legal Aid Certificate of Merit.
- b. **b.** The formal CRCC Portal Confirmation Page for Review File **R2025-009970**, dated October 21, 2025 [Ex. 25].
- c. **c.** The formal RCMP Notice of Direction under Subsection 45.61(3) signed by Inspector Alex Pettigrew, dated September 11, 2025 [Ex. 23].
- d. **d.** The complete CRCC/RCMP Professional Responsibility Unit Email Confirmation Loop, concluding on August 18, 2025, confirming receipt and intake of the systemic multi-docket metadata [Ex. 24].
- e. **e.** The RCMP Privacy Act Request log (**File: P-2025-01812 / EP2025_0340896**), containing the physical notebook entry of Officer Castonguay #57914 explicitly stating **he was NOT the arresting officer** [Ex. 07].
- f. **f.** The final LECA Termination Letter (File E-202410211407481365), demonstrating the execution of the circular referral loop [Ex. 10].

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2026, at the City of Ottawa, Ontario.

DANA-LEE MELFI

Applicant

Contact: DANA_LEE_CA@HOTMAIL.COM

Website: Peace-Man.ca

TO:

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA

Department of Justice Canada

Civil Litigation Section

50 O'Connor Street, Suite 500

Ottawa, ON K1A 0H8

APPENDIX A: SERIALY INDEXED MASTER COURT EXHIBIT REGISTER

Exhibit ID	Primary File / Reference Number	Responsible Agency / Signatory	Short Legal & Factual Explanation of Exhibit Content
Ex. 01	Melfi v. Saskatchewan & Canada Life (2018)	Court of King's Bench / Court of Appeal	THE PRIMARY CIVIL MOTIVE: Formal court rulings denying state motions to dismiss; locking in the upcoming Discovery Date for November 2026.
Ex. 02	Jan 27, 2022 Media Transcripts & Features	New York Times / Canadian Press	Media documentation and photographic records establishing the Informant's global public profile and speech targeting state benefits fraud.
Ex. 03	LAO Certificate - Certificate of Merit Track	Legal Aid Ontario	Formal state-issued certificate proving eligibility for counsel and documenting the private bar's refusal to review the file, establishing a denial of access to justice.
Ex. 04	ATIP Request A-2021-00580	Department of Justice Canada	Original request for legal justification of federal COVID mandates; the definitive catalyst for the targeted state response.
Ex. 05	Complaint File 5822-03179 (2024 OIC 53)	Office of the Information Commissioner	Legally binding final report finding the Department of Justice in flagrant breach of federal law; document held by Informant at time of arrest.
Ex. 06	FIORC Signed Charter (Oct 2, 2017)	Five Eyes Intelligence Council	Signed international intelligence oversight charter establishing the supranational data network used in Project Natterjack.
Ex. 07	RCMP Privacy Act Request P-2025-01812	RCMP ATIP Branch / Mathew Castonguay	THE SMOKING GUN: Contains Officer Castonguay's actual notebook entries explicitly stating he was NOT the arresting officer, unmasking state disclosure forgery.
Ex. 08	RCMP Privacy Act Request P-2025-16851	RCMP ATIP Branch / Monique McCulloch	Active tracking file containing formal written admissions from May 11 and June 1, 2026, confirming Federal Policing is in breach of law and withholding logs.
Ex. 09	OIPRD Case File 25-0127	OIPRD / OPS PSU / Alex Wolf #2076	Original complaint filed immediately after the 2022 arrest; handled by Alex Wolf and willfully failed to transition to LECA.
Ex. 10	LECA Complaint E-202410211407481365	LECA / Senior Investigator Ann Tkachyk	Formal letter dated March 14, 2025, using Section 72 to shut down the file based on the RCMP badge number, intentionally omitting the actions of the OPS hand-off team.
Ex. 11	LECA E-Status Registry Purge Log	Law Enforcement	Digital lookup screenshot dated July 25, 2026, returning a fraudulent "File Not Found"

		Complaints Agency	result, proving active spoliation and erasure of state tracking records.
Ex. 12	OPS Criminal Corruption Complaint 25-299498	Ottawa Police Service / Chief Eric Stubbs	Formal criminal corruption report filed November 3, 2025, containing the Informant's lawful invocation of Section 494(1) Citizen's Arrest powers.
Ex. 13	OPS Assignment Log (June 3, 2026)	Ottawa Police Service	Official internal record confirming that primary target and suspect Alex Wolf #2076 was assigned to criminally investigate his own corruption file.
Ex. 14	IOP Complaint Audit File #26-46	Inspectorate of Policing / Camille Prospero	Formal final screening letter dated January 26, 2026, invoking Section 107(2)(b) to decline an audit by distorting the text of the complaint and fabricating an "isolated error" conclusion.
Ex. 15	IOP Vexatious Threatened Notice (Feb 8, 2026)	Inspectorate of Policing / Camille Prospero	Follow-up email transmitted on Sunday, February 8, 2026, at 3:53 PM officially closing the file and threatening to label the Informant's evidence as "frivolous and vexatious" to permanently silence the investigation.
Ex. 16	Druthers Issue (March 2026)	Druthers National Newspaper	National print feature titled "Where Do You Stand? A Citizen's Four-Year Fight to Correct the Public Record," validated by over 500k readers with no contradictions found.
Ex. 17	Druthers Issue (June 2026)	Druthers National Newspaper	National print feature titled "I Asked if Trudeau's Mandates Were Legal; Ottawa Broke the Law to Hide the Answer," highlighting systemic ATIP non-compliance.
Ex. 18	Peace-Man.ca Blog Logs & Analytics	Independent Public Record Log	Chronological index of metadata, public notices, and traffic analytics proving consistent public dissemination and verification invitations.
Ex. 19	OPS FOI Application Form (Dec 24, 2024)	Ottawa Police Service FOI Branch	The disclosure suppression block: Signed personal record request form containing explicit written text detailing the \$5 mandatory fee trap used to conceal camera grid feeds.
Ex. 20	LECA Screening Letter E-202512221513039775	LECA / Senior Investigator Ann Tkachyk	Letter dated April 2, 2026, screening out the complaint via typographical manipulation and declaring a forgery investigation "not in the public interest".
Ex. 21	LECA Reconsideration Screen E-202606202151022537	Law Enforcement Complaints Agency	Digital confirmation page dated June 20, 2026, proving formal service of the Reconsideration Motion targeting Sgt. Jim Klijoon.

Ex. 22	IOP Rebuttal and Notice Brief (March 8, 2026)	Independent Public Record Log / Dana-Lee Melfi	Applicant's formal response letter documenting the IOP's Sunday-afternoon transmission at 3:53 PM executed to preemptively block MP Cheryl Gallant's House of Commons Petition.
Ex. 23	RCMP Notice of Direction (Sept 11, 2025)	RCMP Professional Responsibility Unit	The mandated referral proof: Formal order signed by Inspector Alex Pettigrew (CRCC File 2025-3732) instructing the Informant to bring his criminal corruption complaints to the Ottawa Police Service.
Ex. 24	CRCC Multi-Docket Metadata Intake Log	Civilian Review and Complaints Commission	THE SYSTEMIC PROOF REGISTRY: Complete copy of the original federal intake email logs documenting that the same officers manipulated evidence across four distinct dockets.
Ex. 25	CRCC Review Submission Confirmation Log	Civilian Review and Complaints Commission	THE REVIEW ABANDONMENT PROOF: Digital portal confirmation screenshot proving the formal lodging of Review File R2025-009970 on October 21, 2025, which remains completely ignored to this day.

Federal Court Filing

Form 301 package to the Federal Court registry clerk at 90 Sparks Street, point directly to **Grounds 1 and 2 (Statutory Non-Response)** and **Exhibit 25**. State clearly to the counter supervisor:

"I am filing an application for Judicial Review against the Attorney General of Canada based on an ongoing, bad-faith statutory non-response. Exhibit 25 proves I formally requested a review from the CRCC Chairperson under tracking number R2025-009970 on October 21, 2025. Under federal administrative law, their choice to leave this file entirely unanswered to prevent the cross-docket forgery from being reviewed constitutes an implied administrative refusal, directly opening the door for this court's review."