

Send

To: ClementM2@ottawapolic.ca

From: Dana-lee Melli <dana_lee_ca@hotmail.com>
Sent: June 8, 2025 2:59:48 PM
Subject: Fw: [EXTERNAL]Re: OPS File 25-299498 & 25-0127 LECA File E-202410211407481365 CRCC 2025-1265157

JudicialReview1.pdf
410 KB

Under the **Community Safety and Policing Act (CSPA)**, an officer who fails to intercede or report another officer's criminal violations faces strict accountability including disciplinary action for misconduct and potential criminal charges. [1, 2]

The legislation and its regulations handle this through the following mechanisms:

1. Mandatory Duty to Report Misconduct

Under **Q. Reg. 407/23 (Code of Conduct for Police Officers)**, there is a positive, legal obligation for police officers to report their peers.

- The Rule:** An officer must report the conduct of another officer if they reasonably believe (or reasonably ought to believe) that the conduct constitutes misconduct. [1]

2. Failure to Act as Misconduct

Failing to report misconduct, or actively turning a blind eye to unlawful actions or rights violations, constitutes an act of professional misconduct. Under the Act to appropriately perform duties or knowingly allowing Charter violations can result in internal discipline, temporary suspension, or loss of pay. O. Reg. 407/23.

3. Protection for Whistleblowers

The CSPA explicitly addresses the "right to report misconduct." **Police Law Group**, Chiefs of Police and police service boards must have written procedures in place to strictly prohibit reprisal against any member of the service who discloses another officer's misconduct. [1]

4. Criminal Code Violations

If the un-reported behavior constitutes a criminal offence (such as assault, theft, or breach of trust), the reporting framework shifts to higher authorities:

- Internal Reporting & Conflict of Interest:** Because investigating fellow officers creates conflicts, **O. Reg. 401/23 (Conflicts of Interest)** requires criminal against a member of a police service to be forwarded to an external, outside police service for investigation. [1]
- External Oversight:** The **Law Enforcement Complaints Agency (LECA)** oversees public complaints and has the power to initiate investigations if it is in the interest. Disclosures can be sent directly to the **Inspector General of Policing**.

From: Dana-lee Melli <dana_lee_ca@hotmail.com>
Sent: June 8, 2025 3:52 PM
To: Mireille Clement <ClementM2@ottawapolic.ca>
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL]Re: OPS File 25-299498 & 25-0127 LECA File E-202410211407481365 CRCC 2025-1265157

Hello Mireille Clement,

It has been three days with no response.

I require a response as soon as possible. If you do not have the answers at this time, a conformation of receipt is needed and a timeline on when the question is answered.

Thank you,
Dana-lee Melli

From: Dana-lee Melli <dana_lee_ca@hotmail.com>
Sent: June 8, 2026 3:52 PM
To: Mireille Clement <ClementM2@ottawapolic.ca>
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL]Re: OPS File 25-299498 & 25-0127 LECA File E-202410211407481365 CRCC 2025-1265157

Hello Mireille Clement,

I hope you understand the difference of an LECA complaint and a criminal case.

LECA does not investigate criminal matters.

The criminal report I submitted and the supporting documents are not for the LECA.

Mr. Wolf said he was adding the files to OIPRD # 25-0127

Never did he indicate he was adding the files to criminal report 25-126157.

When I called in several times (recorded) I was told no officer had been assigned.

"The matters you are raising fall within the mandate of the Law Enforcement Complaints Agency (LECA), which is the independent oversight body responsible for receiving, reviewing and screening public complaints under the *Community Safety and Policing Act*.

I am not in the position to provide any response."

Criminal matters are NOT the mandate of LECA.

I asked two specific questions.

I called for only two reasons.

- To get conformation that an Officer had been assigned to criminal report # 25-299498, Who, and when they were assigned.
- Conformation that the updates to # 25-299498 sent to info@OttawaPolice.ca were received.

So I ask again, Who is assigned, when, by whom, who the receiving the associated files, and after nine months of waiting who will be contacting me for an interview? And also, Why was I given false information that Alex is the investigating officer? That may be an issue with the LECA & IOP on bad record keeping and reporting public false information.

I am adding in a list of file numbers and documents that the case should have. It also should be added to the file. Could you please do that?

That is all for today.

Thank you,

From: Mireille Clement <ClementM2@ottawapolic.ca>
Sent: Thursday, June 4, 2026 12:25 PM
To: Dana-lee Melli <dana_lee_ca@hotmail.com>
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL]Re: OPS File 25-299498 & 25-0127 LECA File E-202410211407481365 CRCC 2025-1265157

Good afternoon,

I have reviewed file 25-126157 and confirmed that Sgt. Wolf is not assigned as the investigator. My review indicates that Sgt. Wolf added several of your emails to the file on your request on December 1 and 15, 2025. These actions do not create a conflict in relation to the file.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Mireille

Mireille Clement
Staff Sergeant
Professional Standards Unit
Ottawa Police Service | ottawapolic.ca
613.236.1222 | P.O. Box 9634, Station T, Ottawa, ON K1G 6H5

You don't often get email from dana_lee_ca@hotmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Good afternoon Mireille Clement,

You are the Staff Sergeant for Alex Wolf # 2076 that is named in criminal report file 25-299498.

This completely false "I am not in the position to provide any response." is unacceptable and noted.

I am directly contacting you to request Alex Wolf be removed as the investigating officer on grounds of "Conflict of Interest".

That is all for today.

Thank you,
Dana-lee Melli

From: Mireille Clement <ClementM2@ottawapolic.ca>
Sent: Thursday, June 4, 2026 12:25 PM
To: Dana-lee Melli <dana_lee_ca@hotmail.com>
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL]Re: OPS File 25-299498 & 25-0127 LECA File E-202410211407481365 CRCC 2025-1265157

The matters you are raising fall within the mandate of the Law Enforcement Complaints Agency (LECA), which is the independent oversight body responsible for receiving, reviewing and screening public complaints under the *Community Safety and Policing Act*.

I am not in the position to provide any response.

If you have additional information regarding a complaint made to LECA or to the Ottawa Police, I suggest you contact the agency and request information be added.

Thank you

Mireille

Staff Sergeant
Professional Standards Unit
Ottawa Police Service | ottawapolic.ca
613.236.1222 | P.O. Box 9634, Station T, Ottawa, ON K1G 6H5

From: Dana-lee Melli <dana_lee_ca@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 4, 2026 12:25 PM
To: Jennifer Hodgson <HodgesonJ@ottawapolic.ca>; Mireille Clement <ClementM2@ottawapolic.ca>; IOP Complaints (SOLGEN) <lopcomplaints@ontario.ca>
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL]Re: OPS File 25-299498 & 25-0127 LECA File E-202410211407481365 CRCC 2025-1265157

Hello Jennifer,

I am going to address Mireille Clement today and wanted to make sure we are clear.

Hello Mireille,

I contact you both today with extremely concerning questions.

I called into the Ottawa Police yesterday and recorded my conversation.

I called for only two reasons.

- To get conformation that an Officer had been assigned to criminal report # 25-299498, Who, and when they were assigned.
- Conformation that the updates to # 25-299498 sent to info@OttawaPolice.ca were received.

to my surprise yesterday (2025-06-04) after over an hour on hold, I was responded with the name of Alex Wolf #2076 as the assigned officer.

Immediately I was caught off guard! Alex Wolf # 2076 Psa@OttawaPolice.ca Police standards unit

is in the criminal complaint specifically due to Original OIPRD complaint never properly transitioned to LECA under (CSPA s. 216). (A violation of CSPA s. 216)

The point to filing a criminal complaint that I received much resistance doing that day and over two hours on the phone, was to make sure the being followed. Because my criminal complaint (Not an OIPRD or LECA complaint) has officers like Alex named in the complaint, a separation of interest" should have been considered. I now see why my not one response from Ottawa Police Service or any officer contacted me on 25-299498.

The only way Officers are protected under LECA is if they are adhering to the CSPA and Criminal Code of Canada.

Now, because you can agree that the OIPRD Case 25-0127 was never transitioned to LECA, it is a violation of CSPA. You know, it's called the law of double standards.

After extensive communications with RCMP and the Commissioners office asking if the RCMP can arrest Ottawa Police officers for multiple criminal acts articulated and shared documents showing the CSPA & Canada's Criminal Code. The answer was to follow procedure on filing with the "Police Jurisdiction" first.

If the Ottawa Police further with the "obstruction of access to justice" keeping all things in mind like "Equality Before and Under the Law". The grounds for the federal agency to invoke the **citizen's arrest power under Criminal Code s. 494(1)** for individuals fleeing authorities and the "obstruction of access to justice" is not a valid reason to obstruct access to justice.

It has been made clear that the LECA does not handle criminal complaints. This does not stop me from filing a "criminal Complaint" with substantiated evidence and more received from RCMP on March 2026 that refute the information the LECA put in "final reports" to the Ottawa Police.

It is the duty to investigate such serious allegations with such detailed documentation.

The email from Jennifer below you can clearly see the LECA "Professional Standards Advisor" NOT adhering to the CSPA and suppressing a criminal investigation.

It is clear that Alex Wolf is in direct "conflict of interest". I have recorded calls with Alex where he understood the importance to file a criminal complaint and even transferred me to intake on 2025 11 03 1:38 pm. So am I to assume, the moment I got off the phone, Mr. Wolf was the assigned officer assigned Alex to the "criminal Complaint" and when?

Now to catch you up, I have not submitted and in the process of securing funding for a Federal Review.

It has not been initiated yet and is just for transparency and why I require answers from Ottawa Police on the Criminal complaint progress.

Any other victim would be afforded this courtesy.

- Will Alex Wolf and any other associated officers that have touched my file be removed on the grounds of "conflict of interest"?
- The **Criminal Code of Canada** addresses these actions under **Section 139 (Obstructing Justice)**. Because it is a hybrid offence, the prosecutor decides whether to pursue it as a less serious summary conviction or a serious indictable offence.

Will you hold your own officers accountable to the indictable Offences occurring related to case 25-299498?

To help you understand clearly I have included a draft of the Federal Review below. (Not initiated)

The LECA are well aware that the Mach 5th completed RCMP ATIP ACT request was fulfilled and proves the "final Report" false on case 202512221513039775 and factually incorrect to their determination.

Despite this the LECA and everyone involved have tried to say that Jennifer here with "Accordingly, no further response will be provided."

This has now become a criminal matter.

Are you failing to see "All things considered" and what that means?

I prefer you give me a written response and/or schedule a face to face appointment.

Dana-lee Melli

SUMMARY OF GROUNDS FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW
Applicant: Dana-lee Melli (Peace-Man)
Date: June 2026

1. Overview
I seek judicial review of decisions, omissions, and ongoing failures by the named respondents. These have prevented correction of proven false information in official court records, Crown disclosures, and oversight complaints arising from my arrest on February 19, 2022. Because of strict time limits in judicial review, the respondents' stonewalling, false final reports, improper ATIP closures, and repeated rejection of new complaints have made compliance impossible.

- Crown S. 2026: RCMP ATIP release proved **Officer #57914 was not** the arresting officer, directly contradicting OPS and RCMP statements, March 5, 2026: RCMP, and other bodies.
- Multiple admitted breaches of the **Access to Information Act** by RCMP (May 11 and June 1, 2026).
- Original OIPRD complaint never properly transitioned to LECA (CSPA s. 216).
- OPS criminal complaint (File #25-299498) unsigned for **eight months**. In this complaint I formally requested a **citizen's arrest Criminal Code s. 494(1)** for individuals fleeing authorities and concealing indictable offences.
- IOP labelled the matter an "isolated administrative error" and closed the file (June 1, 2026) despite new evidence.
- My ATIP to the Department of Justice (A-2021-00580) and the resulting **legally binding OIC Report and Orders (2024 OIC 53)** records contributed to the targeted response.
- Purposed delays, improper closure of initial ATIP requests, forced resubmissions, and rejection of new complaints ("already reviewed" and "information already in the file") have prevented timely correction of the record.
- Repeated polite requests to correct the record have received no substantive response.

3. Grounds for Judicial Review
The decisions and inactions are reviewable on the following bases:

- Refusal to correct proven false information despite RCMP's own evidence.
- Stonewalling and false "final reports" that do not follow the respective statutes have made compliance with strict judicial-review impossible.

b. Unreasonableness

- Labelling systemic record falsification and statutory breaches as an "isolated administrative error" is unreasonable.
- Continued delay and non-response to admitted ATIP breaches and the OPS criminal complaint (File #25-299498) are unjustified.

c. Jurisdictional Error and Failure to Exercise Statutory Mandate

- IOP publicly launched a province-wide inspection (February 9, 2026) into integrity and anti-corruption practices of all 45 municipal services and the OPP yet refused to investigate OPS non-compliance with CSPA record-keeping and disclosure rules.
- Every action taken by OPS after the "hand-off" from RCMP was illegal; OPS knew or had access to know the true arresting officer falsified documents with the courts and Crown.

d. Obstruction of Access to Justice / Criminal Code Violations

- RCMP omitted required information in disclosure under the RCMP Act and, together with OPS, engaged in document manipulation (Criminal Code s. 366) and conspiracy (s. 465(1)(b)) to incriminate an innocent person and, together with OPS, engaged in document manipulation (Criminal Code s. 366) and conspiracy (s. 465(1)(b)) to incriminate an innocent person.
- Despite the legally binding OIC Report and Orders (2024 OIC 53), the RCMP has taken no action — contrary to the Commission statement that it is their duty to investigate and correct. Instead, the one person enforcing the law (myself) was jailed.
- The Department of Justice and Office of the Information Commissioner are central to the overall pattern and must also be included in Federal Court review.
- Alex Wolf # 2076 Psa@OttawaPolice.ca Police standards unit is in the criminal complaint specifically due to Original OIPRD complaint never properly transitioned to LECA under (CSPA s. 216). (A violation of CSPA) & Obstruction of Justice. Alex has now been assigned as the investigating officer "criminal report" case 25-299498. A clear "Conflict of Interest".

4. Public Interest and Merit
This matter has generated significant public interest: hundreds of thousands of interactions across social media, email, and website; the website reporting Canadians for over four years; and direct donations from Canadians to my lawyer and the JCCF for my successful defence. It has also prompted reports using the term "regregious," Written Question Q-866 in the House of Commons, and coverage in Canada's largest independent news outlet.

Conclusion
I have a strong arguable case that the respondents have acted unreasonably, unfairly, and contrary to their statutory mandates. The June 1, 2026 communications and the full documented pattern, including my lawful invocation of Criminal Code s. 494(1) make judicial review both necessary and timely. Correction of the record is required to restore public confidence in policing oversight and the administration of justice.

Once communication is established, files will be provided.

Attachment: Key File Numbers and References
Dana-lee Melli – Judicial Review Application
Date: June 2026

File / Reference Number	Short Explanation
OIPRD Case – 25-0127	Original OIPRD complaint filed immediately after February 19, 2022 arrest. Handled by Alex Wolf (#2076), Police Standards Unit (psa@ottawapolic.ca). Never properly transitioned to LECA under CSPA s. 216.
RCMP Privacy Act Request – p. 2025-01812 (EP2025_0340896)	Processed and closed without addressing any requested items beyond the two pages ignored.
Original DOJ ATIP Request – A-2021-00580	Request for legal justification of federal COVID mandates. Led to legally binding OIC Report and Orders 2024 OIC 53 . I was standing peacefully with these documents when arrested.
OIC Complaint File – 5822-03179	Binding Office of the Information Commissioner report finding multiple breaches by Department of Justice; orders still not complied with.
OIC Report – 2024 OIC 05	Additional final report using the word "regregious" regarding government record handling.
LECA Complaints – E-202512221513039775 and E-202410211407481365	Both files abruptly terminated. LECA has failed to respond to any communication since issuing "Final Reports," even after RCMP referral that their outcomes were based on false information. CSPA not followed in either case.
OPS Criminal Complaint – File # 25-299498	Criminal report filed with Ottawa Police Service (per CRCC #2025) regarding falsified documents and related offences. Unassigned for eight months ; repeated calls confirmed being assigned to Alex Wolf. Problem is Case 25-0127. Alex Wolf # 2076 Psa@OttawaPolice.ca Police standards unit is in the criminal complaint specifically due to Original OIPRD complaint never properly transitioned to LECA (CSPA s. 216).
Ombudsman of Ontario – File # 474926	Complaint referred to Ombudsman; response: "While there may be no role for our office at this time, you are welcome to contact us again in the future."
House of Commons Written Question – Q-866 (45th Parliament)	Tabled by MP Cheryl Gallant regarding DOJ ATIP handling and RCMP/OPS record issues.
June 1, 2026 RCMP Email Threat	Monique McCulloch confirms ongoing delay and operational excuses; second admitted breach.
June 1, 2026 IOP Email Threat	Camille Prospero reiterates file closure and "administrative error" label despite new evidence.

Note: All ties are supported by extensive correspondence, the RCMP notebook pages (March 3, 2026) proving Officer #57914 was **not** the arresting officer, and the full paper trail showing stonewalling, false final reports, improper closures, and refusal to correct the record.

From: Jennifer Hodgson <HodgesonJ@ottawapolic.ca>
Sent: December 18, 2025 3:49 PM
To: PSU <PSU@ottawapolic.ca>; Info <info@ottawapolic.ca>; JUS-G-MAG-LECA Complaints (MAG) <legaccomplaints@ontario.ca>; NCR Prof Resp Responsibility Prof RCN (RCMP/GRC) <rcmp.professionalresponsibility-responsabiliteprof@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>; Commissioner / Commissaire (RCMP) <rcmp.commissioner-commissaire@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>; Veilleux, Jeffrey (RCMP/GRC) <jveilleux@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>; Duhamel, Michael (RCMP) <michael.duhamel@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>; Jennifer Hodgson <HodgesonJ@ottawapolic.ca>
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL]Re: OPS File 25-299498 & 25-0127 LECA File E-202410211407481365 CRCC 2025-1265157


Good afternoon Mr. Melli. Thank you for your email.

As previously advised the matters you are raising fall within the mandate of the Law Enforcement Complaints Agency (LECA), which is the independent oversight body responsible for receiving, reviewing and determining public complaints under the *Community Safety and Policing Act*.

I am not in the position to provide further responses or commentary on the issues you have raised. Any additional concerns, requests for review, or follow up inquiries should be directed to LECA directly.

Accordingly, no further response will be me.

Regards,

 **Jennifer Hodgson**
Professional Standards Advisor
Ottawa Police Service |
Professional Standards Unit
PO Box 9634 Station T
Ottawa, Ontario K1G 6H5
613.236.1222 ext. 5844

From: Dana-lee Melli <dana_lee_ca@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 18, 2025 12:14 PM
To: PSU <PSU@ottawapolic.ca>; Info <info@ottawapolic.ca>; JUS-G-MAG-LECA Complaints (MAG) <legaccomplaints@ontario.ca>; NCR Prof Resp Responsibility Prof RCN (RCMP/GRC) <rcmp.professionalresponsibility-responsabiliteprof@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>; Commissioner / Commissaire (RCMP) <rcmp.commissioner-commissaire@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>; Veilleux, Jeffrey (RCMP/GRC) <jveilleux@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>; Duhamel, Michael (RCMP) <michael.duhamel@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>; Jennifer Hodgson <HodgesonJ@ottawapolic.ca>
Subject: [EXTERNAL]Re: OPS File 25-299498 & 25-0127 LECA File E-202410211407481365 CRCC 2025-1265157

You don't often get email from dana_lee_ca@hotmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Caution: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Good afternoon Jennifer,

I think you are missing the point. I am not logging a complaint or concern about police conduct.

I am filing criminal charges against individuals that have broken the law at the only place issue OPS Professional Standards that can deal with the LECA does not handle criminal complaints.

That is the job of OPS, the police of Jurisdiction. I have gathered the evidence from LECA, CRCC, court filings, OPS disclosure, Charter of Rights and Freedoms and several other places.

Basically the mechanisms that are in place so Officers do not break laws while in the course of their duties.

I have built a "Solid Case" for investigation and OPS is obligated to investigate.

I have never nor ever will file false police reports as the OPS and RCMP have done to illegally prosecute an innocent man. I have built a case that I have identified.

If you think I am just going to bow my head and walk away from this injustice done to me, then you really do not understand my ability as a Canadian.

Thank you for your response on December 15, 2025. I appreciate the confirmation that the information I provided has been received and that the Professional Standards Unit file case 25-0127.

To clarify, my previous communications outlined significant concerns regarding apparent falsification of court documents and police reports from the Ottawa Police Service (OPS) and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP). This includes evidence from LECA File # 202512221513039775 and the Ottawa Police made the arrest, when it was actually conducted by the RCMP officer.

As previously noted, I have an audio recording of my conversation with Alex, in which he was notified of the recording and agreed that he warranted further investigation. Given this, could you please confirm whether case 25-0127 is closed? If it is not, I would like to know the reasons for advancing the investigation within the OPS.

These actions appear to violate two specific sections of the Canadian Criminal Code, supported by evidence from LECA and CRCC medical reports.

- Section 366 (Forgery): Making a false document, knowing it is false, with intent to deceive, including altering genuine documents and adding false information.**
- Section 465(1)(b) (Conspiracy): Agreeing to prosecute or accuse an innocent person of a crime known not to have been committed, potentially penalizes up to 14 years imprisonment in certain cases.**

As officers in positions of public trust, such conduct—if proven—would be held to a higher standard and could attract severe penalties.

To provide further context, my arrest occurred during a peaceful, lawful protest, where I was standing in peace, promoting peace, along with other protesters. I was charged and brought to trial, with notifications explicitly referencing the Emergencies Act. In January 2024, certain Canadian media ruled that the government's invocation of the Emergencies Act in February 2022 was unreasonable, not justifying certain measures violated Charter rights (see Canada (Attorney General) v. Canadian Frontline Nurses et al., 2024 FC 42). This decision under appeal, with hearings held in early 2025. This broader legal context, which appears absent from the reviews of my case, further highlights the potential violations of my Charter rights and the importance of transparency and a thorough investigation.

My rights under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms have been violated, and as a citizen, I have the right to pursue charges and seek justice.

I have initiated File #25-299498 to press criminal charges based on this evidence. Could you please provide the name of the investigator assigned to that file?

I also request that you notify Police Chief Eric Stubbs of this matter and facilitate an appointment for me to discuss it directly with him or a publicly listed email appears non-functional.

Having exhausted civilian oversight mechanisms on a limited income of \$733 per month, I expect the OPS to investigate these serious violations. Failure to act may provide grounds for escalation to federal authorities.

To ensure full transparency and coordination across oversight bodies, I wish to inform you that I am in the process of submitting a new criminal complaint directly to the Canadian Review and Complaints Commission for the RCMP (CRCC) concerning the conduct of RCMP Officer Mr. Castonguay (#57914). This complaint will focus on the alleged falsification of arrest reports, court documents, and related police records conducted by prior LECA and CRCC disclosures (including LECA File #E-202410211407481365 and RCMP Complaint #2025-1265157), w/ contradictory official statements attributing the arrest solely to OPS officers.

This new CRCC complaint complements my ongoing efforts with the OPS Professional Standards Unit and LECA, and underscores my commitment to pursuing **justice before and under the law**, as guaranteed by section 15 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. I will continue to utilize all available civilian oversight mechanisms to seek a thorough, impartial investigation into these serious allegations of misconduct.

I reiterate my previous requests:

- Confirmation of whether case 25-0127 is closed.**
- The name of the investigating officer assigned to file #25-299498.**
- Assistance in notifying and arranging an appointment with Police Chief Eric Stubbs.**

Thank you for your continued attention to this matter. I expect a prompt response in light of the gravity of the issues raised.

Best regards,
Dana-lee Melli

Ottawa Police service are the police of jurisdiction. The RCMP have said to file charges with the police of jurisdiction.

From: PSU <PSU@ottawapolic.ca>
Sent: December 15, 2025 3:09 PM
To: Dana-lee Melli <dana_lee_ca@hotmail.com>

Good afternoon Dana-lee.

Thank you for your email. The information you provided has been received and saved to the applicable Professional Standards Unit file for record-keeping purposes.

If you wish to pursue a further complaint or raise concerns about police conduct, you may do so directly with the Law Enforcement Complaints Agency (LECA).

LECA can be contacted through their website or by phone should you require assistance with that process.

Regards,

 **Jennifer Hodgson**
Professional Standards Advisor
Ottawa Police Service |
Professional Standards Unit
HodgesonJ@ottawapolic.ca
PO Box 9634 Station T
Ottawa, Ontario K1G 6H5
613.236.1222 ext. 5844

To: PSU <PSU@ottawapolic.ca>
Subject: [EXTERNAL]Why are emails not being responded to after asked to send one?

Caution: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Hello Ottawa Police Service.

I was asked by Alex to send an email so he could update file #

(Case 25-0127

Alex Wolf # 2076

Psa@OttawaPolice.ca

Today is 2025 11 03 1:38 pm. Voice call where he confirms the email to Info@OttawaPolice.ca with PDF file DanaLeeVSRCMPOPS

Police standards unit

Transferred to file criminal report.

Tried to refuse to take report several times.

Not a police Officer.

Called Supervisor. 2:23

Supervisor asked for verbal explanation for the report (Recorded).

Filing report.

Case # 25-299498

Ottawa Police Service)

Dana-lee Melli

The contents of this e-mail, including any attachments, are intended for the exclusive use of the named recipient. This e-mail may contain information that is confidential, privileged or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient or a person responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are strictly prohibited from using, disclosing, copying, or distributing this e-mail or any of its contents. If you received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail immediately and permanently delete this e-mail and its attachments, along with any copies thereof. Thank you for your collaboration.

The contents of this e-mail, including any attachments, are intended for the exclusive use of the named recipient. This e-mail may contain information that is confidential, privileged or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient or a person responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are strictly prohibited from using, disclosing, copying, or distributing this e-mail or any of its contents. If you received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail immediately and permanently delete this e-mail and its attachments, along with any copies thereof. Thank you for your collaboration.

The contents of this e-mail, including any attachments, are intended for the exclusive use of the named recipient. This e-mail may contain information that is confidential, privileged or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient or a person responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are strictly prohibited from using, disclosing, copying, or distributing this e-mail or any of its contents. If you received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail immediately and permanently delete this e-mail and its attachments, along with any copies thereof. Thank you for your collaboration.

The contents of this e-mail, including any attachments, are intended for the exclusive use of the named recipient. This e-mail may contain information that is confidential, privileged or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient or a person responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are strictly prohibited from using, disclosing, copying, or distributing this e-mail or any of its contents. If you received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail immediately and permanently delete this e-mail and its attachments, along with any copies thereof. Thank you for your collaboration.

The contents of this e-mail, including any attachments, are intended for the exclusive use of the named recipient. This e-mail may contain information that is confidential, privileged or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient or a person responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are strictly prohibited from using, disclosing, copying, or distributing this e-mail or any of its contents. If you received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail immediately and permanently delete this e-mail and its attachments, along with any copies thereof. Thank you for your collaboration.

The contents of this e-mail, including any attachments, are intended for the exclusive use of the named recipient. This e-mail may contain information that is confidential, privileged or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient or a person responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are strictly prohibited from using, disclosing, copying, or distributing this e-mail or any of its contents. If you received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail immediately and permanently delete this e-mail and its attachments, along with any copies thereof. Thank you for your collaboration.