Diana-Lee Melk
To: McCulloch, Monique (RCMP/GRC); IOP Complaints (SOLGEN); Info - Info@ethicswatch.ca **+3 others**
Mon 2020-06-01 10:51 AM

Monique,

You are incorrect as 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 realize 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 (crime you personally not following the ATIP ACT), Giving false information that my video camera is in the office of the Prime Minister of Canada (When in fact the request fall under the Office of the Information Commissioner mandate). The RCMP has had over four years to have this information categorized and easily obtainable for court purposes. Yet, I still have to deal with this. Official OPS documents RCMP are not ever mentioned as being the erasing effort.

They need "time" for what? To manipulate the documents further?
Remember the Ottawa Judge, I have threatn that are RCMP Officers. I know for fact a RCMP officer in possession of the OTF001 camera footage, I know for a fact the team of Officer #57934 had a dedicated Videographer.
Yet, I have to deal with "Operational time initiated and used. I know for a fact "the Emergencies Act inquiry commission" Where purposely incomplete by omitting said footage. I know for a fact the Ottawa Police Service and RCMP Officers documents RCMP are not ever mentioned and dealt with (OPS)Parts are to the disclosure to the accused and courts.
I know for a fact they had (OPS) 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. Yes, I know that is "Time".
I have given the RCMP an abundance of time to collect the necessary records for court purposes.

If the files I have requested are not produced to me within 30 days from the date of this email (which is 11 days) I 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 these records and the cascade that followed.
The Office of the Prime Minister of Canada is not a video camera.
The Official Notice of Liability will follow shortly.

Sincerely,
Diana-Lee Melk

From: McCulloch, Monique (RCMP/GRC) <Monique.McCulloch@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>
Sent: May 31, 2020 5:29 AM
To: Diana-Lee Melk <diana_lee_ca@hotmail.com>; IOP Complaints (SOLGEN) <iopcomplaints@ontario.ca>; Info <info@ethicswatch.ca>; NCR Prof Responsibility / Responsabilité Prof RCN (RCMP/GRC) <NCRProfessionalResponsibility-ResponsabiliteProfRCN@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>; Commissariat / Commissaire (RCMP-GRC) <RCMPCommissioner-Commissaire.GRC@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>; Greffe Registry <greffe.registry@tbs-sct.gc.ca>
Subject: RE: OPS File # 25-29048, Privacy Act request F-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. Melk – As explained to you on May 17th 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 questions, the RCMP divisions who are tasked to search and gather records do not have resources dedicated solely to respond to RCMP 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 / Conseillère senior ATIPP

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 461, 73 Leikin Drive / Arrêt postal 461, 73 promenade Leikin

Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0R2

monique.mcculloch@rcmp-grc.gc.ca

From: Diana-Lee Melk <diana_lee_ca@hotmail.com>
Sent: May 31, 2020 3:09 PM
To: McCulloch, Monique (RCMP/GRC) <Monique.McCulloch@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>; IOP Complaints (SOLGEN) <iopcomplaints@ontario.ca>; Info <info@ethicswatch.ca>; NCR Prof Responsibility / Responsabilité Prof RCN (RCMP/GRC) <NCRProfessionalResponsibility-ResponsabiliteProfRCN@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>; Commissariat / Commissaire (RCMP-GRC) <RCMPCommissioner-Commissaire.GRC@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>; Greffe Registry <greffe.registry@tbs-sct.gc.ca>
Subject: OPS File # 25-29048, Privacy Act request F-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:
Your request for extension that has also been breached, you state that the request would "interfere with normal operations." Please provide a specific example of how this is true.
Do not ask for my 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 information must state that the records do not exist or that they are exempted under a specific provision (which must be named). In the first request I specifically faxed multiple times. I received only two pages of Officer #57934's notebook confirming he said the arresting officer, with no mention of the arresting officer's name. Officer #57934 **was** the arresting officer. Officer #57934 **was** the arresting officer in the Emergencies Act Inquiry commission and the Access to Information Act and Privacy Act commissioner of the Access to Information Act and the RCMP Act. I was then prepossessed 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 (OPIRD) 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 235, all complaints filed with the OPIRD **prior to April 1, 2024** were required to be continued and handled by LECA under the previous Police Services Act rules. The OPIRD was not abolished but was continued and transitioned into the LECA. The LECA is responsible for handling "legacy" complaints. The IOP/LECA failed to transition my complaint and failed to meet their legal 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 SIRO/LEA and other review processes. In response to my ATIP request, the RCMP released two pages from Officer #57934's notebook that explicitly confirm he was **not** the arresting officer. Despite this, the RCMP had previously represented to oversight bodies that Officer #57934 **was** the arresting officer. This deliberate misrepresentation has created a direct conflict of evidence and has obstructed the independent review process. The RCMP's actions have created a systemic barrier to accountability and transparency. 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 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 to contain false information. The RCMP's actions have created 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 "**elevated complaint**." 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 new evidence, have replied to my repeated 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 relevant statutes, none of these reports or responses are actually meant to be records or part of them, the institution now bears the 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 and corrected can the record be considered accurate and complete.

Your initial response and report did not "consider all things" with "fairness in mind. Your analysis has been deemed my communications to the IOP "frivolous and vexatious" while not following the IOP mandate. I find this to be extremely egregious behaviour.
This has been 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,
Diana-Lee Melk

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 # 25-29048**. I have called multiple times for updates and each time I have been told "no office has been set up."
I find this unacceptable. The OPS is responsible for the criminal investigation. To understand the serious Criminal Code offences involved, including **Obstructing Justice**, **Perjury**, **Fraud**, **Forgery**, **False Statements**, **False Notes**, **Conspiracy**, **Misconduct**, and the host of related charges I am pursuing!
I am formally asking **The Ottawa Police Service** with this email and above the 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 # 25-29048** in detail.

From: Diana-Lee Melk <diana_lee_ca@hotmail.com>
Sent: May 13, 2020 4:29 PM
To: McCulloch, Monique (RCMP/GRC) <Monique.McCulloch@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>; IOP Complaints (SOLGEN) <iopcomplaints@ontario.ca>
Subject: OPS File # 25-29048, Privacy Act request F-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 Officer:** 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]

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 offence for anyone (including RCMP members) to "willfully 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 our filed for another 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 report that the RCMP have been in contravention of the ATIP ACT regarding my submissions.

Diana-Lee Melk

From: McCulloch, Monique (RCMP/GRC) <Monique.McCulloch@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>
Sent: May 11, 2020 2:45 PM
To: Diana-Lee Melk <diana_lee_ca@hotmail.com>
Subject: OPS File # 25-29048, Privacy Act request F-2025-16851 - Extension Notice

Good afternoon Ms. Melk – 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 records will be released to you.

Thank you / Merci,

Monique McCulloch

Senior ATIP Consultant / Conseillère senior ATIPP

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 461, 73 Leikin Drive / Arrêt postal 461, 73 promenade Leikin

Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0R2

monique.mcculloch@rcmp-grc.gc.ca

From: Diana-Lee Melk <diana_lee_ca@hotmail.com>
Sent: May 8, 2020 11:50 AM
To: McCulloch, Monique (RCMP/GRC) <Monique.McCulloch@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>
Subject: OPS File # 25-29048, Privacy Act request F-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 5th 2020 with an extension of thirty days placed on April 6th 2020.

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 records as in a CD, thumb drive?
2. Will the documents be presented in one PDF or multiple PDFs?

Thank you for the continued assistance.

Regards,
Diana-Lee Melk

From: McCulloch, Monique (RCMP/GRC) <Monique.McCulloch@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>
Sent: April 9, 2020 7:50 AM
To: Diana-lee_ca@hotmail.com <Diana-lee_ca@hotmail.com>
Subject: Access Act request F-2025-16851 - Extension Notice

Good morning Mr. Melk:

This is a follow-up to your request under the Privacy Act, which was opened by your office on behalf on March 10, 2020, for:

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

- *The RCMP member who physically arrested me (the one who placed hands on me and effected the cuffing/handcuffing).*
- *Any records, notes, reports, or communications from that member regarding my detentionand.*
- *The full name, badge numbers, and department details associated with formal identifiers. R 19 and 4.12 (including which, if any, corresponds to #57934?@ Mathieu Cardonnagel)*
- *Internal or external reports, incident logs, customer documentation including dispatcher notes, or notes related to the posting 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 #57934 @ Ottawa Carleton Place involved RCMP members at the time of my arrest. This includes any footage capturing verbal interactions (e.g., my request to exit stay 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 recs e.g. notes, reports, or references to the specific City of Ottawa Emergency Order (ref:2020/582;2020?-01) during Project Patriocrat, the Emergencies Act Inquiry sessions, 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 or lack of diligence with claims of a thorough after-action review (e.g., statements from Retired Assistant Commissioner Eric Slaney).

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

- *Social media or mainstream media coverage.*
- *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 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-calendar day 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: https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/A-1/ .

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 – 7th 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 / Conseillère senior ATIPP

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 461, 73 Leikin Drive / Arrêt postal 461, 73 promenade Leikin

Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0R2

monique.mcculloch@rcmp-grc.gc.ca

↩ Reply ↩ Reply all → Forward