



Dana-lee Melfi

Reply Reply all Forward ...

To: JUS-G-MAG-LECA Complaints (MAG); Dana-lee Melfi; IOP Complaints (SOLGEN); Commissioner / Commissaire (RCMP-GRC); Gallant, Cheryl - M.P.

Wed 2026-01-28 8:30 PM

MELFI, Dana Lee - Section 72... 145 KB

Decision Letter S107(2)(b) fil... 240 KB

iop-complaint-form-english... 286 KB

FireShot Capture 733 - Inbox... 803 KB

4 attachments (1 MB) Save all to OneDrive Download all

Subject: Follow-Up on Complaint File 22-A8428 / E-202410211407481365 – Request to Reopen, Correct the Record, Investigate Unsubstantiated Claims, and Address Systemic Failures in Joint OPS-RCMP Operations

[Date: January 28, 2026]

Law Enforcement Complaints Agency (LECA)655 Bay Street, 10th Floor
Toronto, Ontario M7A 2T4

Dear LECA Complaints Director / Review Officer,

I am writing as a follow-up to my existing complaint file 22-A8428 / E-202410211407481365, which was terminated under Section 72 of the Police Services Act on March 14, 2025. Attached are the termination letter, the recent Independent Oversight Panel (IOP) decision, and relevant excerpts from prior correspondence. The IOP explicitly found an "administrative error" in the Ottawa Police Service (OPS) records related to my case, yet this has not been addressed or corrected.

New clarifying information compels me to request that LECA reopen this file for a full review. Specifically, the termination letter references my complaint alleging that I was turned over to the "Hands Off Team," where an officer allegedly provided a statutory caution and secondary caution. This is inaccurate: No such cautions occurred, and there is no evidence to support this claim. These details were inserted into related legal documents (e.g., my Charter Challenge) by my former lawyer without my knowledge or consent, based solely on unverified police disclosure to which I have limited access due to a restrictive agreement. In a brief meeting (under one hour, with only 20 minutes for review at significant personal cost), I was not given adequate opportunity to contest or verify this information.

LECA would not have known this critical clarification prior to termination because no contact was made with me to request evidence, seek input, or conduct a meaningful assessment—despite my offers of supporting materials in the original complaint. This omission demonstrates non-compliance with the Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019 (CSPA) requirements for a rigorous, evidence-based evaluation of "all the circumstances" under s. 107(2)(b), including the essential "in good faith" standard. Decisions repeatedly invoke "All things considered," but how can this hold when key facts were ignored or unexamined?

The Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019 does not mention any internal appeal or reconsideration mechanism for decisions under s. 107(2)(b). This legislative silence does not support the categorical claim that the decision "is not subject to appeal or reconsideration." Judicial review in the Divisional Court remains fully available for challenges based on procedural unfairness, unreasonableness, or error of law.

This inaction ignores the severe harm caused: I faced the real threat of up to 10 years imprisonment, and others have been similarly affected by the same officers (with evidence that neither the IOP nor LECA ever collected or reviewed). By refusing to act on the admitted error, LECA and the IOP are failing in their statutory duties and eroding public confidence in oversight.

This error is compounded by the joint OPS-RCMP operation context (under the Emergencies Act during the Freedom Convoy events). The improbability of coincident "administrative errors" across agencies—such as the OPS file discrepancy versus RCMP records (arresting officer #57914)—suggests systemic issues in record-keeping and coordination, not isolated clerical oversights. The pattern of unaligned errors that minimize or obscure the incident points to deeper procedural failures warranting LECA's systemic review mandate under CSPA.

In the public interest, I firmly inquire: How many other similar "administrative errors" (or record discrepancies/omissions) have been identified, reported, or required correction in joint OPS-RCMP operations over the past five to seven years? Additionally, I request LECA obtain and review the full police disclosure to verify the caution claims and correct the record accordingly. Further, as my complaint relates to an incident prior to April 1, 2024, it should have been seamlessly continued and processed under the Police Services Act provisions by the transitioned LECA (as successor to OIPRD). If OIPRD did not properly transfer or transition my file to LECA upon the April 1, 2024 changeover—resulting in incomplete handling, delays, or gaps in review—this constitutes yet another failure to adhere to statutory requirements during the legislative transition. This adds to the pattern of procedural shortcomings and underscores the need for a full systemic examination of how legacy complaints were managed to ensure no complainants were deprived of due process.

Relevant File and Case References (demonstrating transparency, commitment to law & order, and persistence despite repeated invalidations/dismissals):

- OIC/DOJ Binding Report & Orders:** 2024 OIC 53 – Department of Justice Canada – Multiple initial rejections ("Invalid") before validation; resulted in legally binding orders for file release/compliance by May 17, 2029, with interim releases and six-month updates (full report: <https://www.oic-ci.gc.ca/en/decisions/final-reports/department-justice-canada-re-2024-oic-53>).
- CRCC Public Complaint:** CRCC: 2025-3732 / Our File: 2025-1265157 – Civilian Review and Complaints Commission for the RCMP final decision (no appeal), citing incomplete regard for circumstances in RCMP involvement; confirmed arresting officer #57914 (Mathieu Castonguay).
- RCMP Professional Responsibility File:** NCR Prof Responsibility / Responsabilite Prof RCN Public Complaint #00056504 – Related RCMP internal/public complaint process.
- LECA File:** 22-A8428 / E-202410211407481365 – Law Enforcement Complaints Agency complaint regarding officer misconduct; dismissed without full evidence review.
- Separate OIC/ATIP (RCMP Video Footage):** A-2023-16759 – RCMP response: "Unable to locate" video from Wellington/Metcalf cameras.
- City of Ottawa ATIP:** A-2024-00512 – Request rejected/denied.
- OPS Criminal File:** Case #25-299498 – Criminal complaint filed directly with Ottawa Police Service against two officers for alleged conspiracy to falsify documentation (following CRCC advice).
- OIPRD Legacy Complaint:** Case #25-0127 – Earlier public complaint filed with the Office of the Independent Police Review Director (OIPRD, now LECA); not properly transitioned under CSPA.
- IOP Complaint:** #26-46 – Refused under CSPA s.107(2)(b) (decision January 26, 2026).
- Privacy Corrections:** Ongoing with OPC (federal Privacy Act) and IPC (Ontario MFIPPA/FIPPA).

I would not add in false or fabricated metadata into a criminal case.

The file may be administratively closed, but the unresolved issues remain live, systemic, and in the public interest.

Formal Warning: LECA is not operating in accordance with CSPA law or its mandate. Continuing to issue decisions based on false premises, without proper process or remedial action, constitutes a serious breach of its legal obligations. Such conduct may be challenged in judicial review as LECA "breaking the law" – precisely as I have already proven through official channels that the Department of Justice is breaking the law by non-compliance with lawfully binding OIC orders. My OIC complaints were rejected and marked "Invalid" six times before validation, resulting in a legally binding Report and Orders to the DOJ – now the subject of a motion in Parliament to compel file release to me. This case has attracted major public interest and attention from Members of Parliament. Furthermore, issuing a final determination grounded on false information may constitute fraud under Criminal Code s. 366 (false document / document manipulation). I reserve the right to file criminal charges if warranted.

I urge LECA to reopen this investigation, correct the inaccuracies (including assisting in record rectification per its mandate on adequacy/effectiveness), evaluate compliance with CSPA's good faith requirements, and address potential broader failings. If referral back to IOP or elsewhere is needed, please direct it with emphasis on these unresolved issues. I formally request a review of this decision. The file may be administratively closed, but the unresolved issues remain live, systemic, and in the public interest.

Your prompt action is essential to restoring public trust in oversight processes.

Thank you. I await your response and confirmation of receipt.

Sincerely,

Dana-lee Melfi

dana_lee_ca@hotmail.com (mailto:dana_lee_ca@hotmail.com)

5477 Matawachan Road, Griffith ON K0J 2R0

1-613-570-8990

Peace-Man.ca

Attachments (Full List):

- MELFI, Dana Lee - Section 72 Termination NJ - Complainant.pdf (LECA Termination Letter, March 14, 2025)**

- IOP Decision (full document and/or excerpts highlighting the "administrative error" finding)**

- Prior LECA/OPS Correspondence (highlighting offers of evidence, including audio recordings and disclosures submitted to files 25-0127 and 25-299498)**

- Email threads with LECA and OPS PSU (including Jennifer Hodgson's December 15, 2025 response and circular referral documentation)**

- IOP Supporting Documents from Related Investigations**

- Relevant Court References (e.g., Charter Challenge excerpts where inaccurate caution details were inserted)**

- Additional Evidence References (as offered but not reviewed by IOP/LECA)**

- Ombudsman correspondence that indicates "Individuals are normally expected to first address complaints to existing complaints processes and appeal mechanisms before our Office can become involved."**

Issue with Oversight Bodies

Despite submitting substantial evidence (including audio recordings and official disclosures) to LECA and OPS PSU (files 25-0127 and 25-299498), IOP I have faced a persistent circular referral process:

- LECA directed me to OPS PSU for allegations of criminal conduct.

- OPS PSU (most recently via Jennifer Hodgson on December 15, 2025) advised returning to LECA for conduct complaints.

This has resulted in no substantive investigation, effectively denying me access to justice. I recently requested a review of LECA's decision via oprereviews@ontario.ca, citing delays caused by this impasse, but I am concerned about further administrative unfairness in the oversight system itself.

As a citizen living on a limited income of \$733 per month, I have diligently exhausted available mechanisms, yet my Charter rights (sections 7, 8, and 15) remain unaddressed. This situation undermines public trust in Ontario's policing oversight.

I respectfully request an investigation whether LECA and OPS PSU have administered their processes fairly, reasonably, and in compliance with principles of good administration. Specifically:

- Whether the circular referrals constitute maladministration or unreasonable delay.

- If there has been a failure to facilitate a proper investigation into credible allegations of serious misconduct.

- Recommendations to resolve the impasse and ensure accountability.

Attached are copies of key correspondence, including email threads with LECA and OPS PSU, IOP supporting documents from my investigations, and related court references. I am available to provide additional information or discuss this matter further.

I am committed to transparency, as documented on my website Peace-Man.ca, and believe your intervention is necessary to uphold fairness in Ontario's public services.

Thank you for your attention to this urgent complaint. I look forward to your confirmation of receipt and next steps.

Best regards,

Dana-lee Melfi

5477 Matawachan Rd Griffith Ontario K0J 2R0

1-613-570-8990

dana_lee_ca@hotmail.com (mailto:dana_lee_ca@hotmail.com)

Peace-Man.ca (mailto:peace-man.ca)

Date: December 20, 2025

Reply Reply all Forward