

Subject: IOP Complaint #26-46 (Refused Jan 26, 2026 under CSPA s.107(2)(b)) – Forward of Substantial New Evidence Sent to LECA + Public Interest Considerations

Dear Ms. Prospero,

I am forwarding the full text of my detailed response sent today to LECA Senior Investigator Ann Tkachyk (see below). Dana-lee Melfi submits this correspondence containing **new, previously unconsidered evidence** — personal video recordings, court dockets, ATIP responses showing “unable to locate” or denied camera footage, public photographs with audio, and cross-referenced case files — that directly contradicts the characterization in IOP Complaint #26-46 of the documented discrepancies as an “isolated administrative error.”

The evidence demonstrates a clear pattern involving RCMP Officer **Mathieu Castonguay #57914** and coordinated OPS officers (including **Jim Kiuoon #10234**):

- RCMP Officer **Mathieu Castonguay #57914** physically conducted arrests during the Emergencies Act invocation period as part of the operation to “clear” protesters,
- Omission of RCMP involvement (including that of **Mathieu Castonguay #57914**) from official police records, release documents, court submissions, and disclosures to accused persons,
- Release papers originally listed “Disobey Lawful **Court** Order” but systematically omitted the word “Court” in final versions — exactly the falsification required to implement the Emergencies Act clearing operation,
- *Is accuracy important to you when records are used in court and to justify emergency powers?*
- Withholding or “unable to locate” responses for relevant camera footage across multiple ATIP requests,
- Altered charges and misattributed arrests on release papers (coordinated with unnamed OPS officers directed by Officer **Mathieu Castonguay #57914**, including **Jim Kiuoon #10234** in related events).

Decompartmentalisation of the Record – The Sequential Puzzle

The agencies’ responses have forced a step-by-step reconstruction:

- LECA identified the officer only by badge number **#57914** (no name).
- The subsequent CRCC complaint (2025-3732 / 2025-1265157) finally revealed the name **Mathieu Castonguay** — yet neither LECA nor CRCC ever described the discrepancies as an “administrative error.”
- The OIPRD legacy complaint (Case #25-0127) was never properly transitioned under the CSPA.
- The file then moved to the Ombudsman, then to IOP Complaint #26-46, each body receiving the next piece of the puzzle while refusing to accept the court dockets I had already offered (22-A8408, 22-R15500, Casba Visi arrest, etc.).
- *Why would oversight bodies refuse to accept offered evidence before making a final decision?*

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 (full report: <https://www.oic-ci.gc.ca/en/decisions/final-reports/departement-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 (finally naming **Mathieu Castonguay #57914**).
- 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 (identified **#57914** but no name).
- 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 (including **Jim Kiuoon #10234**) 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).

Failure to Follow the CSPA, Abuse of “Good Faith” Claims, and Direct Violation of Criminal Code Provisions

The *Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019* (ss. 153, 158, 161, 107) requires complete, transparent, and public-interest-driven investigations. By refusing offered evidence, denying clarification/review mechanisms, and issuing final decisions without acknowledging the pattern, both LECA and IOP have failed those obligations.

Oversight bodies repeatedly hide behind claims of acting “in good faith.” However, “good faith” is not a shield — it is legally bound to actual compliance with statutory duties. Dana-lee Melfi has destroyed these “good faith” dismissals in multiple evidence-based replies, yet those replies are consistently ignored or dismissed.

Most absurdly, the IOP misrepresented my complaint #26-46 as accusing **Eric Stubbs** of falsifying documents in arrests — a complete distortion of what Dana-lee Melfi actually submitted.

More seriously, the repeated evasion and withholding of material facts engages **Criminal Code** sections:

- **s. 366** (forgery)
- **s. 465(1)(b)** (conspiracy to commit an indictable offence)

It is illegal to alter and provide inaccurate information in police files and to courts. Both Ottawa Police Service and RCMP have done this. This is clear from LECA Decision on file #E-202410211407481365 and RCMP Complaint 2025-1265157 that finally provided a name to #57914: **Mr. Mathieu Castonguay**. These are the **exact two primary offences** cited in every complaint and criminal case Dana-lee Melfi has filed.

Dana-lee Melfi has always operated on one principle: I would not insert false or misleading information into a criminal case.

Public Interest Implications

- The RCMP stated under oath to the POEC that **no RCMP arrests** occurred under the Emergencies Act invocation.
- Dana-lee Melfi’s evidence proves this false in multiple documented cases involving **Mathieu Castonguay #57914** and coordinated OPS officers including **Jim Kiuoon #10234**.
- *If evidence proves a sworn statement to be false, should that be corrected, or ignored?*
- The 17-page Charter Challenge (filed in 22-A8428, lines 66 & 67 directly countering the illegal arrest — see <https://img1.wsimg.com/blobby/go/ab4b6493-1c16-484d-8c1b-e36a5d0e4123/INFO%2022-A8428%20MELFI%20FORM%201%20-2020JAN%203%2C%202024.docx.pdf>) led to the immediate withdrawal of all charges the moment it was filed — they thought Dana-lee Melfi vs The King was over.
- The case caption changed from “Dana-lee Melfi vs The Queen” to “Dana-lee Melfi vs The King” during the transition — symbolic of the monarchy change while the underlying accountability remained unresolved.
- Without Dana-lee Melfi’s documentation of RCMP/OPS collaboration and systematic falsification/omission (including the “Court” omission on release papers), the POEC submissions could not have been accurate or credible.
- Over 200 arrests occurred — how many court dockets were falsified or omitted RCMP involvement by **Mathieu Castonguay #57914** and others?
- False/omitted information fed to the POEC rendered its conclusions materially flawed, which in turn influenced every downstream oversight decision (LECA, IOP, CRCC, Ombudsman, etc.). None have shown any interest in correcting the record.
- *If the public cannot trust the accuracy of police records, how can they trust the oversight that reviews them?*

The human cost of these falsifications is not abstract.

Dana-lee Melfi was charged under **Criminal Code sections 127(1) (Disobey Lawful Court Order), 129(a) (Obstruct/Resist a Police Officer), 430(1)(c) (Mischief Obstruct Property), and 430(1)(d) (Mischief)** — offences carrying a combined maximum of **multiple decades in jail** — all based on false and incomplete information provided to the court by the same officers (**Mathieu Castonguay #57914** and coordinated OPS members including **Jim Kiuoon #10234**).

Jason VanderWier (docket 22-A8408) was convicted on the **exact same false information** and is now appealing. These are documented cases of the same officers committing the same crimes to falsely imprison citizens.

Dana-lee Melfi maintains his innocence and states the right of peaceful protest is fundamental to a healthy democracy. Dana-lee Melfi is not here to bring the house into disrepute. Dana-lee Melfi is here to hold accountability in a way nobody has seen — for future generations — using the very citizen tools the system itself provides.

When Justin Trudeau said “we are using all tools available,” he never addressed the concerns of millions on the front steps. Dana-lee Melfi is using the tools citizens actually have.

There is still a hidden card they do not know about. They think Dana-lee Melfi vs The King is over. It is not.

Dana-lee Melfi is a case subject that cannot be ignored.

My credibility remains intact. Over 40 years working inside government facilities and billion-dollar corporations, combined with being undefeated in court multiple times, means Dana-lee Melfi does not make these statements lightly.

My Warning remains: Either a real, complete investigation begins — with public acknowledgement and correction of the record — or this full pattern (including the documented “puppeteers” reference, the Criminal Code violations, and the metadata-level knowledge behind it) will be made public immediately.

A Federal Review is imminent. Dana-lee Melfi will fund it myself if necessary. I am seeking a good lawyer willing to examine the evidence, unbiased media willing to review and help present it to the public, and any support that would assist in this effort.

A sincere thank you to the thousands who are already standing with me — your support is visible in the growing views, shares, and engagement across my social media channels (@Danalee10346514 on X), Facebook pages (<https://www.facebook.com/danalee.melfi> & <https://www.facebook.com/peace.man.700311/>), and website www.peace-man.ca/about, where dated blog posts and pages continue to document the journey.

Updates are being made daily as I progress — see the dedicated updates section at <https://www.peace-man.ca/about> blog posts for the latest. All is free and where transparency is key!

I remain ready to provide every file, video, docket, and note immediately.

Thank you for your attention. I look forward to your guidance.

Best regards,
Dana-lee Melfi
dana_lee_ca@hotmail.com (mailto:dana_lee_ca@hotmail.com)

CC:
info@ottawapolice.ca (mailto:info@ottawapolice.ca) (Ottawa Police Service – awareness / OPS Case #25-299498)

From: Dana-lee Melfi <dana_lee_ca@hotmail.com>
Sent: February 3, 2026 9:26 PM
To: Tkachyk, Ann (MAG) <Ann.Tkachyk@ontario.ca>; Info <info@ottawapolice.ca>
Subject: Re: LECA Complaint - Melfi, Dana-lee E-202410211407481365 OPS Criminal Case #25-299498

Subject: Re: Complaint filed October 10, 2024 – Additional evidence and request for further action

Dear Ms. Tkachyk,

Thank you for your email of February 3, 2026, confirming the Complaints Director’s decision to terminate my October 10, 2024 complaint under section 72 of the *Police Services Act* (as continued under the CSPA transition provisions). I must again record the following critical omissions in both the original IOP decision and your response:

- The Inspectorate of Policing (IOP) arbitrarily refused the complaint under CSPA s.107(2)(b) (IOP Complaint #26-46, decision January 26, 2026), characterizing the documented discrepancies (e.g., misattribution of arrests to Ottawa Police only, omission of RCMP involvement, altered charges on release documents) as an “isolated administrative error,” without apparent investigation into the broader pattern or any direction for corrective action/record amendment.
- Neither the IOP nor LECA has acknowledged, addressed, or required correction of these errors—despite their material impact on multiple citizens’ court proceedings, release documents, and public trust.
- The determination was reached without full adherence to the procedural and public-interest requirements of the *Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019* (ss. 153, 158, 161), and without any clarification or avenue of appeal.

These gaps continue to demonstrate non-compliance with the legislation. To directly rebut the “isolated error” label and place on the record evidence that was never reviewed, I now provide the following:

1. I hold my own video recordings (previously offered but never accepted) showing RCMP Officer #57914 personally conducting the arrests of Mr. Jason VanderWier (docket 22-A8408) and myself — I was standing approximately five feet away when he completed VanderWier’s arrest, then immediately turned, pointed a rifle at my head, and advanced with another officer to arrest me.
2. The same officer (#57914) is visible on video directing Ottawa Police to complete the arrests. These events were captured by a camera positioned above the scene (OTT00029875.0001-01), for which I have filed the following ATIP requests:
 - A-2024-00512 (City of Ottawa) – rejected/denied.
 - A-2023-16759 (RCMP) – response: “Unable to locate” video from Wellington/Metcalf cameras.
The Ottawa Police Service ATIP submission was rejected solely because the online system could not process the \$5 fee, and they refused to waive it despite my documented financial hardship (annual income under \$9,000 for the past five years). This is part of a broader pattern of withholding camera footage and manipulating records that I have documented in at least three separate cases involving RCMP, OPS, and OPP.
3. The same camera system captured Officer #57914 making “hands-on” arrests, including that of Mr. Casba Visi (which I witnessed and recorded from an elevated position with a clear, unobstructed view).
4. Publicly available photographs of my own arrest (taken moments before I was cuffed while asking to leave) show me standing alone with multiple recording devices: a 3D camera to my left hooked to a laptop (no sound) and another camera with recorded sound. Both continued running for more than four hours after the arrests. The audio captures the officers discovering the still-recording laptop — yet they did not realize they were being recorded. These images are here: <https://x.com/Danalee10346514/status/2018861724040925246>

This combination of withheld official record, falsified arrest attributions, altered charges, and independent recordings that were ignored or never collected demonstrates a systemic pattern — not isolated administrative errors.

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 (full report: <https://www.oic-ci.gc.ca/en/decisions/final-reports/departement-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.
- 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).

In light of the “at this time” qualifier in your email, the public-interest powers under s. 161 of the CSPA, and the new evidence now before you—coupled with recent reports of over 400 RCMP members facing misconduct allegations in 2024 alone (with dismissals or forced resignations in approximately 5% of cases, a five-fold increase from prior years, per the RCMP’s own Summary Report on the Management of the RCMP Conduct Process 2024)—I respectfully request that LECA:

1. Reconsider further action on the existing file.
2. Accept this correspondence and the attached/referenced materials as a new complaint if re-opening is not possible.
3. Initiate a public-interest investigation under s. 161 CSPA into the pattern of record manipulation, withholding of camera footage, and repeated conduct by the officer(s) identified.
4. Advise immediately on the next steps and the secure method for submitting the video files, court dockets, stenographic notes, and ATIP correspondence.

I am prepared to deliver everything today via secure upload, courier, or in-person drop-off.

My integrity remains intact—I have been undefeated in court at least five times in self-defense against criminal allegations and in related civil actions—and I seek only correction of the record to prevent future coordination failures or misconduct without proper scrutiny, laws, and processes. Until the record is corrected, risks of recurrence persist. It only makes sense that a full criminal investigation proceed as per OPS Case #25-299498 to address the alleged conspiracy to falsify documentation and ensure accountability.

While I understand the screening decision is final under the legislation, judicial review in Divisional Court remains available if these reasonable requests are declined. I would strongly prefer to resolve this inside LECA’s processes.

For awareness and potential jurisdictional follow-up (as Ottawa Police Service is the police of jurisdiction for related incidents and holds Case #25-299498 regarding alleged conspiracy to falsify documentation), I am copying the Ottawa Police Service general contact.

Thank you for your attention. I look forward to your prompt reply.

Best regards,
Dana-lee Melfi
dana_lee_ca@hotmail.com (mailto:dana_lee_ca@hotmail.com)
[Your LECA Complaint Reference Number, if you have it]
CC:
info@ottawapolice.ca (mailto:info@ottawapolice.ca) (Ottawa Police Service – for awareness and potential referral to Organized Fraud Section / follow-up on Case #25-299498)

From: Tkachyk, Ann (MAG) <Ann.Tkachyk@ontario.ca>
Sent: February 2, 2026 11:22 AM
To: Dana_lee_ca@hotmail.com <Dana_lee_ca@hotmail.com>
Subject: LECA Complaint - Melfi, Dana-lee E-202410211407481365

Dear Mr. Melfi,


I have reviewed your emails dated January 28, 2026, and January 29, 2026, in relation to the above noted complaint filed on October 10, 2024.

As per your LECA letter dated March 14, 2025, the Complaints Director determined that your complaint would be terminated as per section 72 of the *Police Services Act*.

At this time, LECA has no authority to “re-open” a complaint that has been closed. No further action will be taken to the above noted complaint.

Regards,

Ann Tkachyk | Senior Investigator
Law Enforcement Complaints Agency (LECA)
655 Bay Street | 10th Floor | Toronto, ON | M7A 2T4
E : ann.tkachyk@ontario.ca
www.LECA.ca

Law Enforcement Complaints Agency **Ontario** 

-This e-mail message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and contains information that may be privileged and/or confidential. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by e-mail to the sender above, and delete this e-mail from your computer. E-mail transmission cannot be guaranteed to be secure or error-free as information could be intercepted, corrupted, lost, destroyed, arrive late or incomplete, or contain viruses. The sender therefore does not accept liability for any errors or omissions in the contents of this message, which arise as a result of e-mail transmission. If verification is required please request a hard-copy version.