Reply
Reply all
Forward

Dana-lee Melfi
To: IOP Complaints (SOLGEN)
Mon 2026-06-01 6:10 PM

Camille Prospero
IOP advisor,

The IOP has been requested by me to investigate the non complience of the CSPA from Ottawa Police service. Period.
This IS WITHIN your jurisdiction and mandate.

The Inspector General's mandate

The Inspector General serves the public interest by promoting accountability in the policing sector, operating at arm's length from the government.
We provide regulatory oversight to ensure compliance with the Community Safety and Policing Act and its regulations.

You initially accepted the responsibility to conduct an investigation and deem the actions as an "Administrative error". Int hat response you did not follow the CSPA.
I never asked you to do anything about the RCMP, but they were acting as a "Joint operation" with the OPS. Their own files indicate that Ottawa Police Service falsified documentation. "Ignorance of the law or mistakes" are no excuse or defence to break the law.
In short the evidence shows that the Ottawa Police Service did not follow the CSPA in my arrest nor the false submissions to the courts.
The Ottawa police have not addressed my criminal complaint:
OPS File # 25-299498

The **Ottawa Police Service (OPS)** and its now-retired officer are also heavily involved in this matter and fall under the same LECA and IOP mandates pursuant to the **Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019 (CSPA)**. Official OPS records and documents containing the false information about the arresting officer were filed with the courts, provided to the Crown Attorney, and disclosed to the accused (myself) for the purpose of mounting a fair defence. These falsified documents are now proven inaccurate by the RCMP's own ATIP release March 5TH 2026. This raises serious concerns about the integrity of evidence used in judicial proceedings and potential breaches of disclosure obligations.

I was advised by the **Civilian Review and Complaints Commission (CRCC)** to file a criminal report with the law enforcement agency of jurisdiction — that is the **Ottawa Police Service (OPS)**. It has now been **eight months** since I filed that criminal complaint with supporting documents under **OPS File # 25-299498**. I have called multiple times for updates and each time I have been told "no officer has been assigned."

You do understand the principles of "Before and Under the law," correct? You do understand the serious Criminal Code offences involved, including **Obstructing Justice**, **Fraud** (document manipulation – s. 366), **Conspiracy** (s. 465(1)(b)), and the host of related charges I am pursuing?

Your initial response and report did not "consider all things" with "Fairness" in mind. Your analyst has deemed my communications to the IOP "frivolous and vexatious" while not following the IOP mandate. I find this to be extremely egregious behaviour.

You completely disregard the fact that OPIRD did not legally and mandatory transition my complaint to the LECA and do not respond to that claim. On it's own is part of the IOP mandate as the transition written into the CSPA, Specifically section 216.

The IOP/LECA are aware from my complaint that the original OIPRD complaint I filed immediately after my illegal arrest was never properly transitioned to the Law Enforcement Complaints Agency (LECA). Under the **Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019** (CSPA), specifically section 216, all complaints filed with the OIPRD **prior to April 1, 2024** were required to be continued and handled by LECA under the previous *Police Services Act* rules. The OIPRD was not abolished but was continued and renamed LECA on that date. The failure to properly transition and administer my pre-April 1, 2024 complaint constitutes a clear contravention of the transition provisions and LECA's statutory obligations. This has resulted in further delay and denial of my right to an independent review of the serious misconduct I alleged against the RCMP & Ottawa Police Service members involved.

I have consulted lawyers regarding the path forward. They have confirmed that because these are being treated as "administrative errors" rather than proper decisions made in accordance with the relevant statutes, none of the reports or responses are currently ready for Juditial review. It remains my responsibility to continue pressing the agencies to acknowledge that the **CSPA, RCMP Act, and Access to Information Act** have not been followed. Only once these violations are properly recognized can the "final" reports be considered accurate and complete.

Specifically what does fall under your mandate in my complaints:

1. Ottawa Police Service (*OPS hereafter) record keeping not following the CSPA.
2. The omission of the real arresting Officer from OPS files is not in accordance with CSPA.
3. Ontario Court submissions involving the Ottawa Police Service (OPS) are governed by the **Provincial Offences Act** for traffic/by-law infractions, the **Criminal Code of Canada**, and the **Rules of the Ontario Court of Justice** . Specific requirements depend on whether the officer is a witness or a respondent. [1, 2, 3]

   1. Mandatory Disclosure and Subpoenas

   Crown Disclosure (Stinchcomb): In criminal and provincial matters, the Crown must disclose all relevant materials—including officers' notes, unedited video, and audio recordings—to the defense. [1, 2]
   Officer Subpoenas: OPS Special Constables in the Court Liaison section serve summons and subpoenas. Officers (as state agents) are mandated to attend court to provide direct testimony to substantiate charges. [1, 2]

   2. General Rules for Submitting Evidence

   Officer Notes: An officer's contemporaneous notebook entries are primary evidence. During hearings, defense counsel or the prosecution may cross-examine officers on these notes. [1]
   Document Filing: All electronic and physical documents must be served and filed in strict accordance with the Ontario Court of Justice Criminal Court Practice Directions. [1]

4. I allege and can prove the OPS did not follow the **Criminal code of Canada**, the **Rules of the Ontario Court of Justice**, nor the **CSPA.**
   This is in your jurisdiction and mandate to investigate.
5. **Clearly from the Access to information requests this was not followed -->** including officers' notes, unedited video, and audio recordings—to the defense. And is an obstruction of justice.
6. Every action the OPS took "**after handoff**" was illegal and is subject to investigation by the IOP.
7. Your attemts of labeling my complaints as "frivolous and vexatious" while not comencing with an investigation is obserd and Obstruction of Justice!
8. The information you received from LECA and RCMP have now been disproven from their own files.
9. How did you deem this an "administrative error" if at the time you feel it was out of your jurisdiction? Furthermore "Jurisdiction" was never mentioned in your first "Final Report" until I responded to that false "final report" that did not follow the CSPA nor the IOP Mandate.
10. In your first final report you misidentify and write false information such as this that was never the case. "You alleged the Chief of OPS committed the criminal offences of forgery and conspiracy because you were an "innocent person "that was prosecuted."
11. Decision: The Inspector General of Policing's (IoP) jurisdiction to deal with complaints is governed by the CSPA. **All complaints are given serious and full consideration, and members of the IoP apply a rigorous assessment process designed to identify complaints which warrant further action.** The CSPA also permits the Inspector General to refuse to investigate policing complaints that are, in their opinion, **not in the public interest**. Under the Community Safety and Policing Act (CSPA), the Law Enforcement Complaints Agency (LECA) holds the exclusive mandate to investigate officer misconduct and manage individual public complaints. The Inspectorate of Policing (IoP) lacks the legal authority to review or challenge LECA's internal processes or final decisions. Consequently, these allegations may be interpreted as an attempt to bypass established oversight finality. Furthermore, the arrest in question occurred in February 2022, predating the CSPA's proclamation on April 1, 2024. As the Act is not retroactive in this capacity, the matter falls outside the IoP's jurisdiction. Regarding the arrest report, the misidentification of an RCMP officer as an OPS officer is considered an isolated administrative error rather than evidence of a systemic failure in service delivery. This discrepancy does not meet the threshold required to demonstrate that the OPS is failing to provide adequate policing services to the community. For concerns regarding record-keeping accuracy, you may contact the Information and Privacy Commissioner (IPC) of Ontario. Section 107(2)(b) of the CSPA permits the Inspector General to decline to investigate a complaint where they have formed the opinion, having regard to all the circumstances, that dealing with the complaint is not in the public interest. In this case, the Inspector General has concluded, based on a review of your complaint, as well as having considered the criteria delineated in subsections 107(3)(a)-(d), that it is not in the public interest to proceed with an investigation. Our file is now closed and is not subject to appeal.
    Sincerely, Camille Prospero Police Service Advisor

    The reluctance of the IOP to do a serious and full consideration is blatant. There was no Rigorous assessment.
    As far as "Public Interest" how are you measuring this?

12. In my challenges to RCMP, LECA, OPIRD, IOP, DOJ, OIC ect, The one commonality they say in "Final reports" is "No public interest".
    They love to hide behind this and state it quite often. But where do they measure this fact that there is?
    The Canadian Citizens, by following and reacting to my content and investigations are helping to squash that claim!
    I am not only gaining "Public Interest" on social media though through tens of thousands of interactions!
    I actually have many Government decisions, Reports and Orders under my belt.
    So much that it is being discussed in the House of Commons and supported by MP's, Lawyers and medical professionals.
    https://www.oic-ci.gc.ca/en/decisions/final-reports/department-justice-canada-re-2024-oic-53
    https://www.ourcommons.ca/written-questions/45-1/q-866?expandquestion=true
13. Canadas largest independent paper has also published articles called "Where do you stand" that has garnered many discussions publicly.
14. Since it is **Camille Prospero** IOP advisor that has been assigned to my file and is not following the CSPA nor the IOP mandate, an NOL (*Notice of personal liability) will follow shortly.
15. The IOP has also been assigned to investigate "Organised crime" within the Ontario district of all police forces. This falls within that request.
16. The reason to send you the RCMP communication is to show multiple agencies not abiding by the various ACT's and Canadas criminal code.

Now, because of your non adherence to the CSPA, the IOP mandate and Canadas criminal code Ms. Camille, I am requesting an appointment to speak with your supervisor.
This is not something to be starting a "Federal Review" on. This is an administrative error on your part.

I will not be fed false information and a total stonewall from you.

Sincerely,
Dana-lee Melfi

From: IOP Complaints (SOLGEN) <IOPcomplaints@ontario.ca>
Sent: June 1, 2026 3:16 PM
To: Dana-lee Melfi <dana_lee_ca@hotmail.com>; McCulloch, Monique (RCMP/GRC) <Monique.McCulloch@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>; IOP Complaints (SOLGEN) <IOPcomplaints@ontario.ca>; Info <info@ottawapolice.ca>; NCR Prof Responsibility / Responsabilite Prof RCN (RCMP/GRC) <rcmp.professionalresponsibility-responsabiliteprof.grc@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>; Commissioner / Commissaire (RCMP-GRC) <rcmp.commissioner-commissaire.grc@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>; _Greffe-Registry <greffe-registry@oic-ci.gc.ca>
Subject: RE: OPS File # 25-299498, Privacy Act request P-2025-16851 - Extension Notice Follow-up: Outstanding Responses Required – RCMP ATIP Breaches, False Information to Oversight Bodies, OPS Falsified Documents, and LECA Transition Failures

Dear Dana-lee Melfi,

Thank you for your correspondence. This response serves to clarify the mandate of the Inspector of Policing (IoP) and formally outline the status of your file. Previously, you were provided with this information.

1. Jurisdictional Limitations
   - The events detailed in your complaint occurred in 2022. This predates the proclamation of the Community Safety and Policing Act (CSPA). The law does not apply retroactively. This is not in the IoP's jurisdiction.
   - The IoP does not hold legislative authority or oversight over the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP).

2. File Status and Administrative Actions
   - The IoP does not investigate allegations of individual misconduct.
   - The IoP has issued its final decision, and your file with our office is officially closed.
   - The IoP does not serve as an appellate body for external agencies. If you wish to contest our decision, the appropriate course of action is to seek a judicial review.

3. Matters Related to External Institutions
   - Your correspondence dated May 13, 2026, involves an Access to Information and Personal Privacy (ATIP) matter directed to the RCMP.
   - The IoP holds no legal authority to alter or correct records maintained by other institutions, including the RCMP. We operate independently and cannot speak or act on behalf of the RCMP or LECA.

As our office has previously provided exhaustive responses on these matters, we will not continue to discuss or repeat this information via email. We continue to recommend that you seek independent legal counsel to guide your next steps.

Sincerely,

Inspectorate of Policing

Camille Prospero
Police Service Advisor

Policing Investigations Unit
777 Bay Street, 7th Floor
Toronto, ON M5G 2C8
www.IOPOntario.ca

Improving policing performance to make everyone in Ontario safer

Follow us on our social media channels X and
LinkedIn

Please note: As part of providing accessible customer service, if you have any accommodation needs, require communication supports, or alternate formats please let me know.

From: Dana-lee Melfi <dana_lee_ca@hotmail.com>
Sent: June 1, 2026 10:52 AM
To: McCulloch, Monique (RCMP/GRC) <Monique.McCulloch@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>; IOP Complaints (SOLGEN) <IOPcomplaints@ontario.ca>; Info <info@ottawapolice.ca>; NCR Prof Responsibility / Responsabilite Prof RCN (RCMP/GRC) <rcmp.professionalresponsibility-responsabiliteprof.grc@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>; Commissioner / Commissaire (RCMP-GRC) <rcmp.commissioner-commissaire.grc@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>; _Greffe-Registry <greffe-registry@oic-ci.gc.ca>
Subject: Re: OPS File # 25-299498, Privacy Act request P-2025-16851 - Extension Notice Follow-up: Outstanding Responses Required – RCMP ATIP Breaches, False Information to Oversight Bodies, OPS Falsified Documents, and LECA Transition Failures

CAUTION -- EXTERNAL E-MAIL - Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Monique,

You are incorrect or purposely giving false information about Central Policing and record keeping. You fail to give the requested status of my request.
And what do you mean "such as this"? "As such, they cannot set aside their operational duties to respond to requests such as this."

By now you realise I am a victim of crimes committed by RCMP and seeking justice that is being purposely met with incomplete responses to requests, incomplete closed files (From you personally not following the ATIP ACT), Giving false information about my only redress is to Office of the Privacy Commissioner of Canada (When in fact parts of the request fall under the Office of the Information Commisioners mandate). The RCMP has had over four years to have this information catagorised and easily obtainable for court proceddings of the arrests they made. In Official OPS documents RCMP are not even mentioned as being the arresting officers.

They need "time" for what? To manipulate the documents further?
Remember these things. I have friends that are RCMP Officers. I know for a fact that RCMP are in possession of the OTT001 camera footage, I know for a fact that the team of Officer #57914 had a dedicated Videographer.
I know for a fact there was use of force initiated and used. I know for a fact "*the Emergencies Act Inquiry submissions*" Were purpously incomplete by ommiting said footage. I know for a fact they were monotoring aspects about me in social media and mainstream media and shared this with OPS(Parts are in the disclosure to the accused and courts).
I know for a fact they had ZERO probable cause for such an illegal arrest and detainment(as the RCMP records will show).

I am just being thorough in mentioning this to you, as to be protected by the ATIP ACT and RCMP ACT, YOU must be following the respective laws or can be held personally liable.
(There is case law on this)
I have given the RCMP an abundance of time to collect the necessary record keeping.

If the files I have requested are not produced to me within 30 days from 2026-06-01 it will be considered a fourth breach of the ATIP ACT and the RCMP ACT.
The RCMP has given false information to the respective oversight agencies, and this information is needed in a timely manner to correct those records and the cascade that followed.
My file is not the only one and is not an "administrative error".
The Official Notice of Liability will follow shortly.

Sincerely,
Dana-lee Melfi

From: McCulloch, Monique (RCMP/GRC) <Monique.McCulloch@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>
Sent: June 1, 2026 6:29 AM
To: Dana-lee Melfi <dana_lee_ca@hotmail.com>; IOP Complaints (SOLGEN) <iopcomplaints@ontario.ca>; Info <info@ottawapolice.ca>; NCR Prof Responsibility / Responsabilite Prof RCN (RCMP/GRC) <RCMP.ProfessionalResponsibility-ResponsabiliteProf.GRC@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>; Commissioner / Commissaire (RCMP-GRC) <RCMP.Commissioner-Commissaire.GRC@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>; _Greffe-Registry <greffe-registry@oic-ci.gc.ca>
Subject: RE: OPS File # 25-299498, Privacy Act request P-2025-16851 - Extension Notice Follow-up: Outstanding Responses Required – RCMP ATIP Breaches, False Information to Oversight Bodies, OPS Falsified Documents, and LECA Transition Failures

Good morning Mr. Melfi – As explained to you on May 11th the tasking with Federal Policing was not yet completed and we are currently awaiting results of the additional searches requested by the RCMP ATIP Branch.

To answer your question, the RCMP divisions who are tasked to search and gather records do not have resources dedicated solely to respond to ATIP requests. As such, they cannot set aside their operational duties to respond to requests such as this. They make every effort to meet the legislative requirements; however, delays are an unfortunate reality given conflicting demands.

Rest assured that I will get back to you as soon as all necessary efforts to locate any records have been concluded. In the interim, as previously explained, you have a right to file a delay complaint with the Office of the Privacy Commissioner of Canada.

Thank you / Merci,

Monique McCulloch

Senior ATIP Consultant / Consultante sénior d'AIPRP

Access to Information and Privacy Branch /

Sous-direction de l'accès à l'information et protection des renseignements personnels

Royal Canadian Mounted Police / Gendarmerie royale du Canada

Mailstop #61, 73 Leikin Drive / Arrêt postal #61, 73 promenade Leikin

Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0R2

monique.mcculloch@rcmp-grc.gc.ca

From: Dana-lee Melfi <dana_lee_ca@hotmail.com>
Sent: May 31, 2026 3:09 PM
To: McCulloch, Monique (RCMP/GRC) <Monique.McCulloch@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>; IOP Complaints (SOLGEN) <iopcomplaints@ontario.ca>; Info <info@ottawapolice.ca>; NCR Prof Responsibility / Responsabilite Prof RCN (RCMP/GRC) <RCMP.ProfessionalResponsibility-ResponsabiliteProf.GRC@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>; Commissioner / Commissaire (RCMP-GRC) <RCMP.Commissioner-Commissaire.GRC@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>; _Greffe-Registry <greffe-registry@oic-ci.gc.ca>
Subject: OPS File # 25-299498, Privacy Act request P-2025-16851 - Extension Notice Follow-up: Outstanding Responses Required – RCMP ATIP Breaches, False Information to Oversight Bodies, OPS Falsified Documents, and LECA Transition Failures

Subject: Follow-up: OPS File # 25-299498, Privacy Act request P-2025-16851 - Extension Notice Follow-up: Outstanding Responses Required – RCMP ATIP Breaches, False Information to Oversight Bodies, OPS Falsified Documents, and LECA Transition Failures

Hello Monique (RCMP), IOP Complaints, OPS and LECA,

It has been another two weeks and both IOP and RCMP have failed to answer my previous response.

To the RCMP first concerning the ATIP requests:

In your request for extension that has also now been breached, you state that the request would "interfere with normal operations." Please provide a specific example of how this is true.

Do we not pay for individuals on a full-time basis in Central Policing to deal with ATIP requests and comply with the Act?

What is the current status of the request? It has now been over two weeks since the breach. Under **Section 67.1** of the Access to Information Act, it is an offence to destroy, mutilate or alter a record, or direct, propose, counsel or cause any person in any manner to do such things with the intent to deny a right of access under the Act.

The RCMP failed to meet its obligations to assist the complainant pursuant to subsection 4(2.1). The RCMP is deemed to have refused access to the requested records under subsection 10(3).

A proper response must be in writing and indicate whether the institution is giving access to any or part of the requested records. When access is given, the records must be provided. When access is denied, the institution must explain that the records do not exist or that they are exempted under a specific provision (which must be named). In my first request I specifically listed multiple items. I received only two pages of Officer #57914's notebook confirming he was **not** the arresting officer, with no mention of the other requested items. The RCMP did not invoke or explain subsection 10(2). Therefore the response was not only incomplete, it was in direct contravention of the Access to Information Act and the RCMP Act. I was then propositioned and forced to submit a new request after the initial one was improperly closed.

To the IOP / LECA:

The IOP/LECA are aware from my complaint that the original OIPRD complaint I filed immediately after my illegal arrest was never properly transitioned to the Law Enforcement Complaints Agency (LECA). Under the **Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019** (CSPA), specifically section 216, all complaints filed with the OIPRD **prior to April 1, 2024** were required to be continued and handled by LECA under the previous *Police Services Act* rules. The OIPRD was not abolished but was continued and renamed LECA on that date. The failure to properly transition and administer my pre-April 1, 2024 complaint constitutes a clear contravention of the transition provisions and LECA's statutory obligations. This has resulted in further delay and denial of my right to an independent review of the serious misconduct I alleged against the RCMP members involved.

Furthermore, the RCMP has now provided clear evidence that it gave **false and misleading information** regarding the identity of the arresting officer to multiple oversight bodies, including the IOP/LECA and other review processes. In response to my ATIP request, the RCMP released two pages from Officer #57914's notebook that explicitly confirm he was **not** the arresting officer. Despite this, the RCMP had previously represented to oversight bodies that Officer #57914 **was** the arresting officer. This misrepresentation has tainted the entire complaint process and demonstrates a lack of candour and integrity in the information provided to independent review mechanisms. Such conduct further undermines public trust in the RCMP's internal accountability processes and strengthens the need for a thorough, independent investigation.

The **Ottawa Police Service (OPS)** and its now-retired officer are also heavily involved in this matter and fall under the same LECA and IOP mandates pursuant to the **Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019 (CSPA)**. Official OPS records and documents containing the false information about the arresting officer were filed with the courts, provided to the Crown Attorney, and disclosed to the accused (myself) for the purpose of mounting a fair defence. These falsified documents are now proven inaccurate by the RCMP's own ATIP release. This raises serious concerns about the integrity of evidence used in judicial proceedings and potential breaches of disclosure obligations.

As per the IOP, this matter was characterized as an "isolated administrative error." Despite my polite requests for assistance in correcting the record following their report, I have received zero communication or action from the IOP. Furthermore, none of the agencies involved now fully aware that the information was false based on the RCMP's own ATIP response, have replied to my repeated polite requests to correct the record.

I have consulted lawyers regarding the path forward. They have confirmed that because these are being treated as "administrative errors" rather than proper decisions made in accordance with the relevant statutes, none of the reports or responses are currently ready for Federal Court review. It remains my responsibility to continue pressing the agencies to acknowledge that the **CSPA, RCMP Act, and Access to Information Act** were not followed. Only once these violations are properly recognized can the "final" reports be considered accurate and complete.

Your initial response and report did not "consider all things" with "Fairness" in mind. Your analyst has deemed my communications to the IOP "frivolous and vexatious" while not following the IOP mandate. I find this to be extremely egregious behaviour.

I require **a separate written response from each agency** (RCMP, IOP, OPS and LECA) addressing the points relevant to their respective responsibilities within the next 7 days.

Thank you,

Dana-lee Melfi

OPS, Ottawa Police Service

I was advised by the **Civilian Review and Complaints Commission (CRCC)** to file a criminal report with the law enforcement agency of jurisdiction — that is the **Ottawa Police Service (OPS)**. It has now been **eight months** since I filed that criminal complaint with supporting documents under **OPS File # 25-299498**. I have called multiple times for updates and each time I have been told "no officer has been assigned."

You do understand the principles of "Before and Under the law," correct? You do understand the serious Criminal Code offences involved, including **Obstructing Justice**, **Fraud** (document manipulation – s. 366), **Conspiracy** (s. 465(1)(b)), and the host of related charges I am pursuing?

I am formally **cc'ing the Ottawa Police Service** with this email and the above file number. I request an in-person appointment in Ottawa at a mutually convenient time so that I may make the necessary travel arrangements to discuss **OPS File # 25-299498** in detail.

So to the RCMP first concerning the ATIP requests.

1. In your request for extension that has also now been breached, you state that the request would "interfere with normal operations"

   Please provide an example how this is true.

   Do we not pay for individuals on a full time basis to deal with ATIP's in Central Policing to comply with the ACT?

2. What is the status of the request right now? It has been over two weeks since the breach and now considered under Section 67.1 makes it an offence to destroy, mutilate or alter a record, or direct, propose, counsel or cause any person in any manner to do such things with the intent to deny a right of access under this Act.
3. RCMP failed to meet its obligations to assist the complainant pursuant to subsection 4(2.1).
4. RCMP is deemed to have refused access to the requested records under subsection 10(3).
5. What is a response?

   The response must be in writing and indicate whether the institution is giving access to any or part of the requested records.

6. When the response indicates that the institution has **given access** to the records or part of them, the institution must provide access to those records.
7. When the response indicates that the institution has **denied access** to the records or part of them, the institution must explain that the records do not exist or that the institution has exempted them, or part of them, under a specific provision, which the institution must name.

   8. [19] In specific circumstances, the institution may refuse to confirm or deny in its response whether records exist under subsection 10(2).

   9. In my first request I specifically stated may items in my request.

   I received 2 pages of Officer #57914's notebook that confirmed he was NOT the arresting officer but not one mention of the other items requested. The RCMP institution did not explain or quote 10(2). Therefore the response was no only incomplete, it was against the ATIP ACT and Law.

   10. I was propositioned and basically forced to submit a new request as they closed the initial one because it was in contravention of the ACT and RCMP ACT.

   11. Delaying information and obstructing Justice.

Now, IOP I have given all the evidence of the RCMP not following the RCMP ACT, ATIP ACT and also breaking the laws to conspire with OPS and breaking the CSPA.

1. Your initial response and report did not "consider all things" with "Fairness" in mind. Did not follow the CSPA.

2. Your analyst has deemed my communications to the IOP "frivolous and vivacious" while not following the IOP mandate. I find this to be extremely egregious behaviour.

3. The IOP are aware in my complaint that the OPIRD complaint made immediately after my illegal arrest was never transitioned to the LECA in contravention of the law. Failed to address this entirely.

4. Zero attempts in assisting to correct the record.

5. The actions of the IOP and others shows no impartiality in their extremely egregious behaviour towards me.

OPS, Ottawa Police Service

I was advised by the **Civilian Review and Complaints Commission (CRCC)** to file a criminal report with the law enforcement agency of jurisdiction — that is the **Ottawa Police Service (OPS)**. It has now been **eight months** since I filed that criminal complaint with supporting documents under **OPS File # 25-299498**. I have called multiple times for updates and each time I have been told "no officer has been assigned."

You do understand the principles of "Before and Under the law," correct? You do understand the serious Criminal Code offences involved, including **Obstructing Justice**, **Fraud** (document manipulation – s. 366), **Conspiracy** (s. 465(1)(b)), and the host of related charges I am pursuing?

I am formally **cc'ing the Ottawa Police Service** with this email and the above file number. I request an in-person appointment in Ottawa at a mutually convenient time so that I may make the necessary travel arrangements to discuss **OPS File # 25-299498** in detail.

From: Dana-lee Melfi <dana_lee_ca@hotmail.com>
Sent: May 13, 2026 4:29 PM
To: McCulloch, Monique (RCMP/GRC) <Monique.McCulloch@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>; IOP Complaints (SOLGEN) <iopcomplaints@ontario.ca>
Subject: Re: Privacy Act request P-2025-16851 - Extension Notice

Hello Monique and IOP complaints,

In Canada, hindering or obstructing justice is a serious criminal offence under the *Criminal Code* (Section 139), involving willful attempts to pervert the course of justice, such as by threatening, bribing, or inducing someone to lie. Offences can be prosecuted by indictment, carrying a maximum 10-year prison sentence, or by summary conviction. [1, 2]

Key Aspects of Obstructing Justice in Canada

- **Definition:** Section 139(2) covers any intentional attempt to obstruct, pervert, or defeat the course of justice in a judicial proceeding.
- **Specific Examples:**
  - **Dissuading a Witness:** Using threats, bribes, or corruption to stop someone from giving evidence (Section 139(3)).
  - **Indemnifying a Surety:** Agreeing to compensate a person who acts as a surety to help a person in custody, or accepting such compensation.
  - **Perverting Law:** Tampering with evidence, providing false information to police to deflect investigations, or destroying evidence.
- **Penalties:**
  - **Indictable Offence:** Up to 10 years imprisonment.
  - **Summary Conviction:** Up to 2 years less a day in jail and/or a $5,000 fine.
- **Related Offences:**
  - **Obstruction of Peace Officers:** Resisting or willfully obstructing a public officer (Section 129).
  - **Intimidation of the Justice System:** Engaging in conduct intended to cause fear in a justice system participant (police, prosecutors) (Section 423.1). [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]

Key Legal Principles

- **Willful Intent:** The action must be done intentionally and with the specific purpose of obstructing the justice process.
- **Judicial Proceeding:** The obstruction must relate to an actual or proposed legal proceeding (e.g., criminal investigation, court hearing). [1]

For more specific information on different types of obstruction, the Criminal Law Notebook offers a detailed overview of the offence.

The RCMP have provided false information to the oversight bodies such as LECA and IOP.

The RCMP have failed to abide by the ATIP ACT laws.

The RCMP are now hindering my Federal Review and thus attempting to obstruct, pervert, or defeat the course of justice in a judicial proceeding.

The law is not just for citizens, it is for law enforcement to follow.

- **Criminal Code of Canada (s. 139)**: This is the actual law that makes it an indictable offense for *anyone* (including RCMP members) to "wilfully attempt" in any manner to obstruct, pervert or defeat the course of justice in a judicial proceeding." It applies fully to RCMP officers, and they have been prosecuted under it in the past.
- **Internal RCMP discipline**: If such conduct occurred, it would almost certainly be investigated as a Code of Conduct violation (under the framework in the RCMP Act) *in addition to* any criminal charges.

In short, the RCMP Act sets up the disciplinary system and high-level ethical expectations for members, but the specific prohibition on obstructing justice in judicial proceedings is a *Criminal Code* matter that applies universally.

You have not filed for another extension before your admission, therefore:

"Should you wish to discuss this matter further, contact the undersigned. Please quote our file number appearing above."

When I am instructed to ask any questions related to my request, you as the contact and Senior ATIP Consultant are to answer the questions promptly.

Breaking the law like the ATIP ACT does NOT give you an excuse not to answer my questions.

I request and expect the answers promptly please.

This is now the second request that the RCMP have been in contravention of the ATIP ACT regarding my submissions.

Dana-lee Melfi

From: McCulloch, Monique (RCMP/GRC) <Monique.McCulloch@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>
Sent: May 11, 2026 2:41 PM
To: Dana-lee Melfi <dana_lee_ca@hotmail.com>
Subject: RE: Privacy Act request P-2025-16851 - Extension Notice

Good afternoon Mr. Melfi – Unfortunately the tasking with Federal Policing is not yet completed and we've had to follow-up once again today. This means of course that we have failed to meet the legislative due date which was today.

I will get back to you as soon as all necessary searches have been completed, at which time I can answer your questions regarding how any additional information (if any) will be released to you.

Thank you / Merci,

Monique McCulloch

Senior ATIP Consultant / Consultante sénior d'AIPRP

Access to Information and Privacy Branch /

Sous-direction de l'accès à l'information et protection des renseignements personnels

Royal Canadian Mounted Police / Gendarmerie royale du Canada

Mailstop #61, 73 Leikin Drive / Arrêt postal #61, 73 promenade Leikin

Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0R2

monique.mcculloch@rcmp-grc.gc.ca

From: Dana-lee Melfi <dana_lee_ca@hotmail.com>
Sent: May 8, 2026 11:50 AM
To: McCulloch, Monique (RCMP/GRC) <Monique.McCulloch@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>
Subject: Re: Privacy Act request P-2025-16851 - Extension Notice

Hello Monique,

Just a reminder before the RCMP breaches the ATIP ACT again, you have two more days to provide the files to my request made March 10th 2026 with an extension of thirty days placed on April 9th 2026.

Central Policing better take note that if anything is missing I will know and act accordingly with follow ups.

As per:

"Should you wish to discuss this matter further, contact the undersigned. Please quote our file number appearing above."

Questions:

1. How will the videos be delivered? Will it be by a link or will they be provided on recorded media as in a CD, thumb drive?
2. Will the documents be presented in one PDF or multiple PDF's?

Thank you for the continued assistance.

Regards,

Dana-lee Melfi

From: McCulloch, Monique (RCMP/GRC) <Monique.McCulloch@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>
Sent: April 9, 2026 7:30 AM
To: Dana_lee_ca@hotmail.com <Dana_lee_ca@hotmail.com>
Subject: Privacy Act request P-2025-16851 - Extension Notice

Good morning Mr. Melfi:

This is a follow-up to your request under the Privacy Act, which was opened on your behalf on March 10, 2026, for:

1. All records related to my arrest in Ottawa on February 19, 2022 (Dana-Lee MELFI Date of Birth June 26, 1971) including but not limited to:

- *The RCMP member who physically arrested me (the one who placed hands on me and effected the cuffing/handover).*
- *Any records, notes, reports, or communications from that member regarding my detention/arrest.*
- *The full names, badge numbers, and deployment details associated with helmet identifiers A-19 and A-12 (including which, if any, corresponds to #57914/Sgt. Mathieu Castonguay).*
- *Any use-of-force reports, incident logs, command documentation including deployment tactics, or reviews related to the pointing of a firearm at my head during this encounter.*

2. Any footage or records of on-site audio and/or video recordings from February 19, 2022, including from body-worn cameras, team recording devices, or other surveillance equipment used by Officer #57914/Sgt. Castonguay or any involved RCMP members at the time of my arrest. This includes any footage capturing verbal interactions (e.g., my request to walk away and the officer's statement that I was being arrested under the Emergencies Act), contradicting the notebook's "no verbal interaction" claim.

3. Any information relating to my arrest held in copies, excerpts, logs, reports, or references to the specific City of Ottawa camera feed (ott00029862.0001-01) during Project Natterjack, the Emergencies Act Inquiry submissions, or any other internal reviews. If the RCMP did not access or review this footage despite situational awareness capabilities during the events, please include any records explaining this omission and how it aligns with claims of a thorough after-action review (e.g., statements from Retired Assistant Commissioner Eric Slinn).

4. Any additional records about me from January 25 to March 25, 2022, including but not limited to:

- *Social media or mainstream media monitoring.*
- *Intelligence, command, or operational files mentioning my presence, activities, or arrest.*
- *Any reports or orders related to Emergencies Act enforcement, including handovers to OPS that may have framed arrests as local (e.g., mischief) to minimize federal scrutiny.*

Rest assured that the RCMP ATIP Branch continues to be committed to assisting you with your ATIP requests and, while we await a reply to our tasking from Federal Policing, an extension of 30 days beyond the 30-day statutory time limit is required accordance with paragraph 15(a)(i) of the Act. The extension is due to a large volume of records being searched and because meeting the original time limit would unreasonably interfere with their operations. A description of subparagraph 15(a)(i) can be found at: http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/P-21.

Please be advised that you are entitled to lodge a complaint with the Privacy Commissioner concerning the processing of your request. In the event you decide to avail yourself of this right, your notice of complaint should be addressed to:

Office of the Privacy Commissioner of Canada
30 Victoria Street, 1st Floor
Gatineau, Quebec K1A 1H3

Additional information on the complaint process can be found at the following link: https://www.priv.gc.ca/en/report-a-concern/file-a-formal-privacy-complaint/

Should you wish to discuss this matter further, contact the undersigned. Please quote our file number appearing above.

Thank you / Merci,

Monique McCulloch

Senior ATIP Consultant / Consultante sénior d'AIPRP

Access to Information and Privacy Branch /

Sous-direction de l'accès à l'information et protection des renseignements personnels

Royal Canadian Mounted Police / Gendarmerie royale du Canada

Mailstop #61, 73 Leikin Drive / Arrêt postal #61, 73 promenade Leikin

Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0R2

monique.mcculloch@rcmp-grc.gc.ca