

From:

Fax:

Phone:

Email:

FAX

To: Geoffrey B. Morawetz (the honorable man who acts as Chief Justice)

Fax: 1.416.325.2872

Phone: 1.416.327.5094

Pages: 40 (including this cover page)

RE: Claim 'trespass on the case' Court File: CV 19-00000081
Restoration of Property [Court File] demanded Post Haste

Greetings Geoffrey,


This communication is HIGH PRIORITY required for Geoffrey to address;

This is time sensitive i, require a written reply faxed or emailed to contact info provided;

i, thank you for your time and attention to address this verified 'trespass on the case';

Kind Regards,

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY: The information contained in this facsimile message is intended only for the use of the man or woman named above. If the reader of this message IS NOT 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 immediately notify us by telephone and return the original message to us. Thank you.




Geoffrey B. Morawetz (a man who honorably acts as 'Chief Justice')
Chief Justice of the Superior Court of Justice of Ontario
Regional Senior Justice's Office
361 University Ave.
Toronto, Ontario M5G 1T3
Ph: 416-327-5094
Fx: 416-325-2872

Date: November 20, 2019

Re: Claim 'trespass on the case' Court File: CV 19-00000081
Restoration of Property [Court File] demanded Post Haste

Greetings Geoffrey,

This communication 1st requires immediate action to correct 'trespass on the case' by public servants;
i : man established 'Manary Court' [common law court] Exhibit #1 September 17, 2019 in St. Thomas;
i, claim;

1. no man or woman will claim i, property;
2. no man or woman can administrate property without right;
3. St. Thomas Superior Court of Justice [Elgin County Courthouse] a **PUBLIC** courthouse not **PRIVATE**;
4. No man or woman acting as public servants can obstruct or deny another man or woman a right;
5. written response is required Lynda [a woman] C. Templeton, Scott [a man] Campbell [Exhibit#3];
6.  Court' at no time released jurisdiction to Lynda under the 'Rules of civil procedure';
7. **i, a man not bound to 'Rules of Civil Procedure', Rules promulgated by a Legal Society in which i, am not a member, nor wish to be'**
8. **i, did/do not converse in legalese, nor is there a law which claims i [man or woman], must in order to pursue a claim through a public [Superior Court of Justice] venue; [Exhibit #2]**

i, require written verifiable 'findings of facts and conclusions in law' produced if above not be true;

i, require immediate restoration of property [CV 19-00000081] to the St. Thomas public courthouse;

The 'Memorandum of Understanding' between 'Chief Justice of the Superior Court of Justice of Ontario' and 'Attorney General of Ontario' requires Geoffrey [all under his control] correct the record;

From the 'Memorandum of Understanding' that is to remind and guide Geoffrey of his servant duties;

"The Attorney General and the Chief Justice recognize the dynamic and changing nature of the Court and the administration of justice in the Province, and the need for an accessible, modern, effective and efficient justice system that serves the needs and interests of the public."

"The staff members of the Office of the Chief Justice are public servants appointed under the Public Service Ontario Act, 2006 and public service staffing policies, superannuation and other employee benefits and conditions of employee and collective agreements apply to them."

Geoffrey [as Lynda and Scott] massive conflict of interest with Doug [Downey] and others at the Ministry of the Attorney General [Legal Department for a SERVICE corporation 'ONTARIO'] is fact;

Unless Geoffrey [any man or woman who wear black robes] claim PUBLIC courthouse is a PRIVATE courthouse and/or we the people are 'property' to administrate over then i, expect Geoffrey to move like lighting to address and correct honorably these vexatious and repugnant actions [not to mention punishable by law] by we the people if not corrected immediately.

Geoffrey position as Chief Justice can simply address and restore confidence, provide a Justice versed in common law assigned to 'The Manary Court' and a court date is set for "public process hearing" as addressed within court filing September 17th 2019 on the first page [Notice: Liability] Numbers 7-10 ;

***Process follows LAW [common law: common to the people in this case]
LAW does not follow process [created by public servants that is NOT law over the people]***

The [REDACTED] Court' is a right exercised by people to access honorably/correctly a public courthouse;

i, as [REDACTED] have demonstrated honorably in all communications to court staff in St. Thomas, a right we the people hold to access ANY public courthouse and move court and claim outside of a PRIVATE society [bar] honorably.

The RCMP [Staff Sergeant Cathy McCrory - Serious & Organized Crime Section] and intake are aware;

This is the last step as we the people have evidence [verified] up the chain of command of said service corporations 'SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE' and 'GOVERNMENT OF ONTARIO' of Serious & Organized Crime is occurring. This requires Geoffrey correct honorably as the role he has been given requires.

All courthouse staff given notice November 8th 2019 on public record have ignored [as of this writing];

We wish to work with all in our public courthouse and it is protected....and insures we the people have access and control over our court actions moving swiftly thru the correct justice system;

This is more than a 'process' issue by public servants. We have a crisis Geoffrey in consciousness and not just with said servants but all of the people due to foundational lies such as LEGAL applies to man or woman... it does not... it only applies to PERSON[S] a LEGAL construct 'created without consent'

Was Geoffrey ever taught truth about jurisdiction?...i, don't believe so;

The word 'LAW' ...where does it come from? It applies to the 3 jurisdictions in our world [fact]

Land = Common Law = Ten Commandments = Creator [law of man or woman]= law of the land

Air = Ecclesiastical / Cannon Law = Trust Law

Water = LEGAL = Admiralty & Maritime = Contract Law [Corporations/PERSONS/fictions created]
This is taught to all BAR members... it is the law of the SEA.... nothing to do with [wo]man.

The only way 'rules of civil procedure' apply to i, or any man or woman is if we consent otherwise we have every right to move our claim and court like lightning thru our public courthouse to seek justice;

We the people are not accessing public courthouses to waste court resources or cause conflict;

We require the honorable people acting as Justices work with we the people to insure justice is accessible, transparent and on the public record when it affects all [people] and our trust given.

We require the honorable people acting as Justices, court clerks and staff to bear witness at our public courthouses during prosecutions to insure when jury of our peers renders a decision it is so ordered;

Maxims of Law

"Where truth is, fiction of law does not exist."

"An action does not arise from fraud"

i, a man who sometimes acts as counselor at law have standing in 'The [REDACTED] Court' and honorably communicate the required written verifiable response if claims 1-8 not be true... otherwise Geoffrey correct the record so we may collectively address this trespass on the case honorably moving forward;

i, and [REDACTED] family wish to forgive all who trespass if corrected swiftly and with honor;

Kind Regards,

Christopher James
[REDACTED]

Cc: RCMP Staff Sergeant Cathy McCrory 'Serious & Organized Crime Division'

Exhibit # 1

**(Do Not Trespass on the case)****Notice: Liability**

i [man], one of the people give 'Notice : Liability';

1. All Ontario Superior or Provincial Courthouses are PUBLIC Courthouses;
2. We the people hold the RIGHT to access said public courthouses to seek justice;
3. We the people hold the RIGHT to lay information without trespass against us;
4. We the people hold the RIGHT to invoke 'common law' move claim and court;
5. All honorable people working at courthouse have duties and obligations to serve;
6. Duties & obligations DO NOT trump the RIGHTS of the people to access justice;
7. No [wo]man at said courthouse can administrate my property [filing] without right;
8. i, require the [wo]man assigned acting as 'Judge' is well versed in common law;
9. i, require all NOTICE[S] are read and understood by all assigned to [REDACTED] Court;
10. i, require a "Public Process Hearing" date to address jurisdiction/process is lawful;

Liability [Trespass on the case] occurs if any [wo]man ignore RIGHTS of the people;

i, will swear under oath or affirmation that all here in said be true.



Dated September 17th, 2019



in
[redacted] Court'
at

Superior Court of Justice
Elgin County Courthouse
4 Wellington Street
St. Thomas ON N5R 2P2

Claim: Trespass

i [man], one of the people now cometh and place on the public record 'Claim: Trespass'
with the honorable man or woman acting as 'Judge or Magistrate', at said public
courthouse [Elgin County Courthouse] in St. Thomas Ontario, a court of record [redacted]
Court] moving under the common law with a trial by jury [not jury trial] is invoked;

i, say here, and will verify in open court, that all herein be true.



[redacted signature line]

Dated: September 17th, 2019

in
[REDACTED] Court'
at
Superior Court of Justice
Elgin County Courthouse
4 Wellington Street
St. Thomas ON N5R 2P2

Notice: Characteristics of party:

Prosecutor / *PRO SE*

The [REDACTED] Court' presents Notice:

- Firstly: i, declare that a characteristic of the man, who moves his court and 'my case' (through this venue), is that of a *prosecutor* and not that of a [thing] "*PRO SE*";
- Secondly: Any document filed into 'my case' with the word "*PRO SE*"; affixed, court is to take notice of the wrongful conversion and see the term as, *prosecutor*;
- Thirdly: Any further reference(s) to i, a man, the *prosecutor*, as being referred to as that *thing* stylized as a "*PRO SE*", court is to take notice as, **contempt of court**;

i, say here, and will verify in open court, that all herein be true

[REDACTED]

Dated: September 17th 2019

in
[REDACTED] Court'
at
Superior Court of Justice
Elgin County Courthouse
4 Wellington Street
St. Thomas ON N5R 2P2

Notice: court; Court; COURT

The [REDACTED] Court' presents notice:

- Firstly: Court is under control to the law, common to the people [common law]
- Secondly: i, a man, do not surrender my case to act under 'civil rules of procedure'
- Thirdly: i, a man, for the ease of the court clerks filing purposes only, use forms;
- Fourthly: i, a man see no benefit as being subject to the 'civil rules of procedure', Rules promulgated by a Legal Society in which i, am not a member, nor wish to be;
- Fifthly: i, say here, and will verify in open court, that all herein be true

[REDACTED]

Dated: September 17th 2019


in


 Court'

at

Superior Court of Justice
Elgin County Courthouse
4 Wellington Street
St. Thomas ON N5R 2P2

Notice: Jurisdiction

The  Court' presents notice:

- Firstly: i, a man, enter 'my case', [suit; accoutrements, &c...] at 'Public Courthouse'
- Secondly: i, pay money into public courthouses to hold court and access justice;
- Thirdly:  Court' is a 'court of record'
- Fourthly: A 'court of record': proceeding according to the common law (law: common);
- Fifthly: In a 'court of record', the tribunal is independent of the magistrate;
- Sixthly: A 'court of record': has the power to fine or imprison for contempt;
- Seventhly: Suits in common law, the right to trial by jury shall be preserved;
- Eighthly: i, a man, as suitor, will choose the manner in which i, present my case to a jury;
- Ninthly: No [wo]man, nor person within or outside of this Courthouse, has the capacity to: interfere; amend; alter; modify; interpret; deny my claim, prior to a verdict tendered from a jury;
- Tenthly: i, say here, and will verify in open court, that all herein be true



Dated: September 17th 2019

in
[REDACTED] Court'
at
Superior Court of Justice
Elgin County Courthouse
4 Wellington Street
St. Thomas ON N5R 2P2

Notice: Venue

The [REDACTED] Court' presents notice:

Firstly: i, a man, enter 'my case', [suit; accoutrements, &c...] into [REDACTED] Court'

Secondly: [REDACTED] Court' is to convene at, a public courthouse;

Thirdly: The public courthouse, in where 'my case' lies, is known as 'The Elgin County Courthouse' in St. Thomas Ontario;

Fourthly: At all times 'my case' lies in [REDACTED] Court' moving under the common law;

Fifthly: i, say here, and will verify in open court, that all herein be true



Dated: September 17th 2019

Court File No: ~~CV-000~~

CV-19-000000 81-0000

in



Court'

at

Superior Court of Justice
Elgin County Courthouse
4 Wellington Street
St. Thomas ON N5R 2P2

i: man :



Prosecutor



Rod Phillips: a man;
Doug Downey: a man;
Dean Eastman: a man;
Deon Cousins: a woman
Jeff Quann: a man;

Wrongdoer(s)

STATEMENT OF CLAIM

TO THE WRONGDOERS(S);

A PROSECUTION HAS COMMENCED AGAINST WRONGDOER(S) by the Prosecutor. The Claim is set out in following pages filed at the 'Elgin County Courthouse' a PUBLIC courthouse.

A court of record moving under the common law... trial by jury has commenced.

IF WRONGDOER(s) DO(ES) WISH TO DEFEND AGAINST SAID CLAIM, the wrongdoer(s) must file a common law claim to defend, serve it on the prosecutor, and file it, with proof of service into the [redacted] Court' Court File No. above at the "Elgin County Courthouse", WITHIN TWENTY ONE [21] DAYS after served on wrongdoer(s), if served on the land known as Ontario.

IF WRONGDOER(S) FAIL TO DEFEND THIS CLAIM, JUDGEMENT WILL BE ORDERED AGAINST THE WRONGDOER(S) IN THEIR ABSENCE AND WITHOUT FURTHER NOTICE.

JURISDICTION OF [REDACTED] Court': LAND [COMMON LAW OF THE PEOPLE]

THIS IS NOT A LEGAL [JURISDICTION] COURT FILING OR PROCEEDING.

THE RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE DO NOT APPLY UNDER COMMON LAW.

THERE IS NO APPEAL PROCESS.

The common law of the people is invoked by i: [REDACTED]

SEP 17 2019

Date:..... Issued by: [REDACTED]
Local Registrar

Address of Public Courthouse: Superior Court of Justice
Elgin County Courthouse
4 Wellington Street
St. Thomas ON N5R 2P2

Wrongdoer(s):

Rod Phillips: a man
Home address unknown
c/o Ministry of Finance
7 Queens Park Cres.
7th floor, Frost Building
Toronto, Ontario M7A 1Y7
P: 1.416.325.0400
F: 1.866.888.3850

Doug Downey: a man
Home address unknown
c/o Ministry of the Attorney General
720 Bay Street 11th Floor,
McMurtry-Scott Building
Toronto, Ontario M7A 2S9
P: 1.800.518.7901
F: 1.416.326.4007

Prosecutor[s] for Manary Court

[REDACTED]

Counselor at law / Co-Prosecutor

[REDACTED]

Dean Eastman: a man
Home address unknown
c/o Ministry of Finance
7 Queens Park Cres. 7th floor, Frost Building
Toronto, Ontario M7A 1Y7
P: 1.416.325.0400
F: 1.866.888.3850

Deon Cousins
Home address is unknown
c/o Ministry of Finance
7 Queens Park Cres. 7th floor, Frost Building
Toronto, Ontario M7A 1Y7
P: 1.416.325.0400
F: 1.866.888.3850

Jeff Quann: a man
Home address is unknown
c/o Ministry of Finance
7 Queens Park Cres. 7th floor, Frost Building
Toronto, Ontario M7A 1Y7
P: 1.416.325.0400
F: 1.866.888.3850

CLAIM

1. i, claim:

- a) Said wrongdoer(s) trespass [malfeasance, theft, extortion, barratry];
- b) Said wrongdoer(s) cause wrong and harm that began October 25th 2018;
- c) Wrong and harm continues to this day September 17th 2019;
- d) Damages [financial as of Aug 27th 2019] \$10, 425,471 (Ten Million four hundred and twenty five thousand four hundred and seventy one [Exhibit #3];
- e) Punitive damages in the amount of \$10,000,000.00 [TEN MILLION] for the intentional malfeasance in public office, theft, intentional infliction of mental suffering, terrorizing Manary family, extortion, intimidation and barratry;
- f) Costs of this action;
- g) Such further decisions [incarceration] is left to 'jury of my peers' if warranted;

OVERVIEW [BRIEF]

- 4. i, [REDACTED] family, my wife [REDACTED] and our children have run a family farm for 30 years without trespass. We grow vegetables and tobacco from our land and take enormous pride and care in our products and integrity with all who are involved with seeing the end delivery of our property [product grown] to customers;
- 5. i, and my family have been exporting Tobacco successfully [Exhibit 2] without trespass by agents of Ministry of Finance for the service corporation ONTARIO since November 3rd 2014 [26 orders completed] until 1st trespass Oct 25th 2018;
- 6. My property [tobacco shipment/ entire year of harvest] going to RR Global was trespassed [theft] beginning Oct 25th 2018 when the wrongdoer Dean Eastman placed a call to Quebec police without right to administrate my property [stopped shipment/seized it] without right;
- 7. Out of the blue this trespass occurred requiring immediate action at our end which was swift and focused to insure our year of work was not compromised for buyer;

8. We have never had a single issue up to this point with shipping manifests ...but as before this shipment docs were all in order but the wrongdoers at the Ministry of Finance began vexatious actions towards us making demands upon demands for documentation which we supplied immediately but was not accepted. This made no sense to us as to why this was happening, and why the wrongdoers would not accept our verified documents pertaining to shipment of tobacco [property];
9. This began a domino effect with a 2nd load to RR Global November 2nd, 2018 also trespassed upon without right by wrongdoer's administrating my property;
10. November 8th, 2018 final load was shipped without trespass to Old Belt Tobacco;
11. Our property was never returned valued at \$387,522.00 October & November 2018 and to this date i, and my family have no idea where it went or our income restored;
12. i, received a call shortly after 2nd trespass in November from an unknown caller [id was blocked] stating... "The mob has your property [tobacco]" and hung up. We have no clue to this day who called or where our property has gone;
13. Since the theft of our property the wrongdoers have continued to harass and make demands under the service corporation ONTARIO "Raw Leaf Tobacco program";
14. Due to breach of trust and theft of our property without cause or right we did not renew registering or any working relationships when license expired Dec 31st 2018;
15. i, am informed on top of the loss and theft of our property that the wrongdoers claim further a penalty [debt] February 28, 2019 of \$346,097.25 which we have addressed repeatedly but without success to settle trespass honorably;
16. i, have required the obligation [contract] produced wrongdoer Rod relies who claims a debt is true, claims debt is due and now past due has not been produced;
17. i, and my family have never in our lives dealt with such an attack [Exhibit 3] on our life's work by agents of a service corporation who are to protect the property of their fellow man not steal it. We have been treated as if we are running drugs, guns or trafficking children. The wrongdoers have continued a campaign of terror by way of barratry, liens, and recently physical confrontation occurring at our home by unannounced OPP officer intimidation tactics for wrongdoer[s] unlawful access;
18. i, honorably sent May 29th 2019 NOTICE to 12 MOF agents requiring them to stop said wrong and harm [registered mail]... not one man or woman replied;

19. Aug 27, 2019 we secured the correct counselor at law and communicated 4 times to both Rod and Doug to come together and address this wrong and harm and settle this so this doesn't happen again to any other people whom they are to serve not steal while further acts of extortion to destroy are family farm built on 30 years;

FACTS

20. There is no obligation [contract] a [wo]man will present for debt be due or true;
21. There is no wrong or harm i, or my property [tobacco] caused to my fellow man;
22. There is no verified 'bill of particulars' showing damage or loss incurred;
22. No agents or officers of the service corporation ONTARIO can administrate a [wo]man property without right;
21. The facts [documents/all actions] are all known to wrongdoers at this time and will be presented correctly at the time and place a jury of my peers is seated;
22. i, make said claims and move my court under full liability what i claim be true;
23. i, rely upon:
 - a) We the people are not property of another man or woman or corporation;
 - b) There is no man or woman who can administrate my property without right;
 - c) Contract makes the law;
 - d) Jury of my peers will decide if said wrong and harm as claimed here be true;
24. i, require this action is heard in public at Elgin County Courthouse in St. Thomas;

DATE: September 17th 2019

EXHIBIT # 2

Complete Load History for Sprucepoint Farms Ltd.

- November 3, 2014 – M One Manufacturing, Ontario – 60 big bales @ 34900 lbs
- January 21, 2015 – M One Manufacturing, Ontario – 34 big bales + 160 small bales @ 33905 lbs
- April 1, 2015 – M One Manufacturing, Ontario – 60 big bales @ 46870 lbs
- May 20, 2015 – M One Manufacturing, Ontario – 10 big bales @ 7210 lbs
- August 8, 2015 – M One Manufacturing, Ontario – 14 big bales @ 9590 lbs
- December 7, 2015 – Delhi Tobacco Manufacturing, Ontario – 50 big bales @ 29595 lbs
- December 8, 2015 – Delhi Tobacco Manufacturing, Ontario – 54 big bales @ 32160 lbs
- February 12, 2016 – Independent Leaf Tobacco Co, New York USA – 60 big bales @ 40679 lbs
- February 23, 2016 – Independent Leaf Tobacco Co, New York USA – 56 big bales @ 33443 lbs
- March 4, 2016 – Independent Leaf Tobacco Co, New York USA – 60 big bales @ 35262 lbs
- March 21, 2016 – Independent Leaf Tobacco Co, New York USA – 58 big bales @ 33774 lbs
- March 22, 2016 – Norfolk Natural Tobacco, Ontario – 7 big bales @ 4157 lbs
- April 18, 2016 – Independent Leaf Tobacco Co, New York USA – 60 big bales @ 39717 lbs
- March 2, 2016 – Independent Leaf Tobacco Co, New York USA – 60 big bales @ 41973 lbs
- May 12, 2016 – Independent Leaf Tobacco Co, New York USA – 60 big bales @ 42160 lbs
- May 24, 2016 – Independent Leaf Tobacco Co, New York USA – 50 big bales @ 32653 lbs
- May 31, 2016 – Independent Leaf Tobacco Co, New York USA – 42 big bales @ 24727 lbs
- October 24, 2016 – Norfolk Natural Tobacco, Ontario – 25 big bales @ 16944 lbs
- November 28, 2016 – Norfolk Natural Tobacco, Ontario – 11 bales @ 7840 lbs
- November 3, 2017 – Diniz Farming Ltd., Ontario – 60 big bales @ 40710 lbs
- November 6, 2017 – Diniz Farming Ltd., Ontario – 60 big bales @ 39255 lbs
- November 26, 2017 – Felicia DeSouza, Kingston Jamaica – 2 boxes @ 500 lbs
- March 16, 2018 – Felicia DeSouza, Kingston Jamaica – 4 barrels @ 500 lbs
- September 21, 2018 – R&R Global, Egypt – 40 big bales @ 29219 lbs
- October 20, 2018 – Old Belt Tobacco, North Carolina USA – 60 big bales @ 43623 lbs
- October 30, 2018 – Old Belt Tobacco, North Carolina USA – 60 big bales @ 45393 lbs
- **October 30, 2018 – October 30 - R&R Global, Egypt - 44 big bales @ 29837 lbs [TRESPASS]**
- **November 2, 2018 – R&R Global, Egypt – 44 big bales @ 32209 lbs [TRESPASS]**
- November 8, 2018 – Old Belt Tobacco, North Carolina USA – 60 big bales @ 41707 lbs

i, will swear under oath or affirmation that all here in said be true.



Dated: Aug 27 2019

EXHIBIT # 3

Bill of Particulars [TRESPASS AS OF AUG 2019]

1. Lost 2018 contract with R&R Global 1,600,000 lbs – 29219 lbs (1 st load) = 1,570,781 lbs x \$3/lbs	\$4,712,343.00
2. Destroyed tobacco 129,174 lbs x \$3	\$387,522.00
3. ACC Payment interest	\$20,000.00
4. FCC Loans and Mortgage interest	\$205,858.96
5. Lost 2019 contract with R&R Global 1,600,000 lbs x \$3	\$4,800,000.00
6. Lawyer fees for seized tobacco Tatner - \$10,000 McNish - \$3,577.88 Shadley - + <u>\$6,169.84</u>	\$19,747.72
7. Time addressing the Ontario Ministry of Finance and Lawyers (October 2018-August 27, 2019) 150 hrs x \$200/hr	\$30,000.00
8. [REDACTED] Farm Loss of 2019 tobacco crop \$1 per lbs x 250,000 lbs	<u>\$250,000.00</u>

Trespass Claim Amount: **\$10,425,471.68**

i, will swear under oath or affirmation that all here in said be true.

[REDACTED]

i:
i:
i:
[Redacted]

Rod Phillips: a man;
Doug Downey: a man;
Dean Eastman: a man;
Deon Cousins: a woman;
Jeff Quann: a man
Wrongdoer(s)

Prosecutor[s]

CV 81/19.

in
[Redacted] Court'
at
Superior Court of Justice
Elgin County Courthouse
4 Wellington Street
St. Thomas ON N5R 2P2

PROCEEDING COMMENCED AT ST. THOMAS

STATEMENT OF CLAIM

[Redacted]

"Exhibit #2"

i: man: [REDACTED] v. Phillips - Ruling Templeton, J.

SCJ-CSJ Decisions St. Thomas <SCJ.CSJ.Decisions.StThomas@ontario.ca>

Thu 11/7/2019 4:26 PM

To: [REDACTED]; Wagner, Eric (MAG) <Eric.Wagner@ontario.ca>

 1 attachments (95 KB)

Manary.doc;

Please see attached Ruling of Justice L. Templeton.

In order to allow time for all persons directly affected by this decision to be notified of it by counsel, please refrain from sharing it with the media or with anyone not directly connected with the case, for a period of 24 hours.

Please note, this email account was created primarily for sending outgoing emails only and is not monitored. Any unsolicited emails or inquiries (including correspondence to specific officials or members of the court) will not be acknowledged, processed, redirected.

family v. Phillips, 2019 ONSC 6469

COURT FILE NO.: CV81/19

DATE: 20191107

ONTARIO

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE

BETWEEN:

i: man [REDACTED] family

self-represented

Prosecutor

- and -

Rod Phillips: a man; Doug Downey: a man;
Dean Eastman: a man; Deon Cousins: a
woman; Jeff Quann: a man

Eric Wagner for the “Wrongdoers”

Wrongdoer(s)

CONSIDERED: November 7, 2019

RULING

Templeton J.

- [1] This is a Ruling pursuant to Rule 2.1.01 (1) of the *Rules of Civil Procedure* which states that “the court may, on its own initiative, stay or dismiss a proceeding if the proceeding appears on its face to be frivolous or vexatious or otherwise an abuse of the process of the court”.
- [2] The Ruling is sought by the Defendants¹ in this action by way of a letter² to the Registrar of this Court dated October 28, 2019.
- [3] In the letter, counsel at the Crown Law Office (Civil) with the Ministry of the Attorney General seeks a dismissal of the action on the basis that the Statement of Claim appears on its face to be frivolous and vexatious.
- [4] This manner of request is provided for in Rule 2.1.01 (6) which permits any party to the proceeding to file with the registrar a written request for an order under subrule (1).

¹ They were named by “i: man: [REDACTED]” in the style of cause as “Wrongdoers”.

² A copy of the letter was sent to [redacted] at the address indicated on the Statement of Claim.

- [5] The response by letter of “i: man: [REDACTED] family” was received on November 6, 2019 and is reviewed below. For ease of reference and with no disrespect intended, he is referred to hereinafter as [REDACTED]
- [6] For the reasons that follow, the request for a dismissal of this action from counsel at the Crown Law Office (Civil) with the Ministry of the Attorney General is granted.

The Legal Principles

- [7] Rule 1.06 (1) of the *Rules of Civil Procedure* requires that the forms prescribed by these rules *shall* be used where applicable and with such variations as the circumstances require. In view of the wording, this Rule is mandatory. There has been no request for a variation and no evidence that the circumstances in this case require variation(s).
- [8] All necessary forms required throughout the course of litigation in Ontario are readily available to the public electronically and may also be obtained on request at a Superior Court of Justice or any law firm. There is no request or evidence before me in support of any variation from the forms prescribed by the Rules.
- [9] Rule 14.06 (1) states that,
- Every originating process shall contain a title of the proceeding setting out the names of all the parties and the capacity in which they are made parties, if other than their personal capacity.
- [10] Further Rule 14.06 (2) requires that,
- In an action, the title of the proceeding shall name the party commencing the action as the plaintiff and the opposite party as the defendant.
- [11] The within proceeding is an action.
- [12] Rule 2.01 (1) provides that,
- A failure to comply with these rules is an irregularity and does not render a proceeding or a step, document or order in a proceeding a nullity, and the court,
- (a) may grant all necessary amendments or other relief, on such terms as are just, to secure the just determination of the real matters in dispute; or
- (b) only where and as necessary in the interest of justice, may set aside the proceeding or a step, document or order in the proceeding in whole or in part.
- [13] In *Khan v. Krylov & Company LLP*, 2017 ONCA 625, the Ontario Court of Appeal observed the following:

The law concerning rule 2.1 is new and evolving. It was largely summarized in *Scaduto v. The Law Society of Upper Canada*, 2015 ONCA 733, 343 O.A.C. 87, leave to appeal refused, [2015] S.C.C.A. No. 488, at paras. 7-9. This court accepted the approach taken by Myers J. in a series of cases including *Gao v. Ontario (Workplace Safety and Insurance Board)*, 2014 ONSC 6497, 37 C.L.R. (4th) 7 (“*Gao (No. 2)*”) and *Raji v. Border Ladner Gervais LLP*, 2015 ONSC 801. The court noted in *Scaduto* that “the use

of the rule should be limited to the clearest of cases where the abusive nature of the proceeding is apparent on the face of the pleading and there is a basis in the pleadings to support the resort to the attenuated process” (at para. 8).

Justice Myers provided an important caution, at para.18 of *Gao (No. 2)*:

It should be borne in mind however, that even a vexatious litigant can have a legitimate complaint. It is not uncommon for there to be a real issue at the heart of a vexatious litigant's case.... Care should be taken to allow generously for drafting deficiencies and recognizing that there may be a core complaint which is quite properly recognized as legitimate even if the proceeding itself is frivolously brought or carried out and ought to be dismissed.

[14] In *Gao v. Ontario (Workplace Safety and Insurance Board)*, 2014 ONSC 6497, Justice Myers wrote the following:

In the context of rule 2.1 there is no need for persistence of any one or more factors. It is expected that most cases under rule 2.1 will not require much depth of analysis. Many of the cases that are of the type that I have been referring to herein will be obvious on their face. The court receives a number of unintelligible proceedings and repeat attempts to bring the same matters on again and again. Many of these proceedings bear some of the unmistakable hallmarks of querulous litigant behavior such as:

Form

- Curious formatting.
- Many, many pages.
- Odd or irrelevant attachments—e.g., copies of letters from others and legal decisions, UN Charter on Human Rights etc., all usually, extensively annotated.
- Multiple methods of emphasis including:
 - highlighting (various colours)
 - underlining
 - capitalization.
- Repeated use of “”, ???, !!!.
- Numerous foot and marginal notes.

Content

- Rambling discourse characterized by repetition and a pedantic failure to clarify.
- Rhetorical questions.
- Repeated misuse of legal, medical and other technical terms.
- Referring to self in the third person.
- Inappropriately ingratiating statements.
- Ultimatums.
- Threats of violence to self or others.
- Threats of violence directed at individuals or organizations.

These signs may assist in determining whether an action is a *bona fide* civil dispute or the product of vexatiousness. I would also include among these signs or factors, many of the hallmarks of OPCA litigants described by Rooke, A.C.J., in *Meads v. Meads*, 2012 ABQB 571 (CanLII).

The Statement of Claim³

(i) The Style of Cause

³ Schedule “A”

- [15] At the top of the document entitled Statement of Claim, are the words, “in [REDACTED] Court’ at Superior Court of Justice Elgin County Courthouse, 4 Wellington Street, St. Thomas, ON N5R 2P2”.
- [16] The first party identified in the style of cause is “i: man: [REDACTED] family”. It is unknown whether this is his legally registered name. This is significant in the context of liability for actions taken in an assessment of costs, for example, or counter-suit.
- [17] [REDACTED] has also identified himself as a “Prosecutor” in this proceeding. The second parties (normally referred to as the Defendants) are identified in the style of cause as “Wrongdoer(s)” and are listed as follows:
- Rod Phillips: a man;
 - Doug Downey: a man;
 - Dean Eastman: a man;
 - Deon Cousins: a woman;
 - Jeff Quann: a man

(ii) The Notice

- [18] The Notice section of the Statement of Claim starts out with the words “TO THE WRONGDOER(S)”. In civil law, such a characterization of a party prior to any determination of liability is highly prejudicial.
- [19] The Notice goes on to read:

A PROSECUTION HAS COMMENCED AGAINST WRONGDOER(S) by the Prosecutor. The Claim is set out in the following pages filed at the “Elgin County Courthouse’ a PUBLIC courthouse.

A court of record moving under the common law ...trial by jury has commenced...

IF WRONGDOER(s) DO(ES) WISH TO DEFEND AGAINST SAID CLAIM, the wrongdoer(s) must file a common law claim to defend, serve it on the prosecutor and file it, with proof of service into the [REDACTED] Court’ Court File No. above at the “Elgin County Courthouse’

IF WRONGDOER(S) FAIL TO DEFEND THIS CLAIM, JUDGEMENT WILL BE ORDERED AGAINST THE WRONGDOER(S) IN THEIR ABSENCE AND WITHOUT FURTHER NOTICE.

JURISDICTION OF [REDACTED] Court’: LAND [COMMON LAW OF THE PEOPLE]

THIS IS NOT A LEGAL [JURISDICTION] COURT FILING OR PROCEEDING.

THE RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE DO NOT APPLY UNDER COMMON LAW.

THERE IS NO APPEAL PROCESS.

The common law of the people is invoked by i [REDACTED] Family/prosecutor.

(iii) The Claim and Particulars

- [20] It appears that [REDACTED] seeks a judgment on the basis of the legal concepts of trespass, malfeasance, theft, extortion and “barratry”. It is impossible to ascertain from the pleading what [REDACTED] means with respect to the term “barratry”. It may well be that this is a simple spelling error and [REDACTED] is referring to “battery”, but that is unknown.
- [21] [REDACTED] seeks in excess of \$10 million dollars in damages and a further \$10 million in punitive damages.
- [22] On the basis of the section in the Statement of Claim that has been entitled “Overview [Brief]”, it appears that [REDACTED] his wife and family have operated a family farm for thirty years. They grow vegetables and tobacco. Between November 3, 2014 and October 25, 2018 they sold tobacco in Ontario and in the United States.
- [23] [REDACTED] then alleges “My property [tobacco shipment/entire year of harvest] going to RR Global was trespassed [theft] beginning October 25th 2018 when the wrongdoer Dean Eastman placed a call to Quebec police without right to administrate my property [stopped shipment/seized it] without right....This began a domino effect with a 2nd load to RR Global November 2nd, 2018 also trespassed without right by wrongdoer’s administrating my property...Our property was never returned valued at \$387,522.00 October & November 2018 and to this date I, and my family have no idea where it went or our income restored... Since the theft of our property the wrongdoers have continued to harass and make demands under the service corporation ONTARIO “Raw Leaf Tobacco program”...Due to breach of trust and theft of our property without cause or right we did not renew registering or any working relationships when license expired Dec. 31st 2018”
- [24] Under a section entitled “Facts”, [REDACTED] has stated,
- “There is no obligation [contract] a [wo]man will present for debt be due or true;”
 - “There is no wrong or harm I, or my property [tobacco] caused to my fellow man;”
 - “There is no verified ‘bill of particulars’ showing damage or loss incurred;”
 - “No agents or officers of the service corporation ONTARIO can administrate a [wo]man property without a right;”
 - “The facts [documents/all actions] are known to wrongdoers at this time and will be presented correctly at the time and place a jury of my peers is seated;”
 - “i, make said claims and move my court under full liability what i claim to be true;”
 - “I, rely upon:
 - (a) We the people are not property of another man or woman or corporation;

- (b) There is no man or woman who can administrate my property without right;
- (c) Contract makes the law;
- (d) Jury of my peers will decide of said wrong and harm as claimed here be true.”

- [25] It appears from the general gist of the complaint that tobacco that was being delivered by ████████ to a customer, was seized by the Ministry of Finance on at least one or occasions and that he therefore seeks both general and punitive damages on the basis of the alleged wrongful seizure.
- [26] Other than an allegation that Dean Eastman placed a call to the police in Quebec, there are no particulars with respect to how and in what capacity each of the named persons were involved in the actions complained of by ████████
- [27] According to its website⁴, the Ministry of Finance regulates the Raw Leaf Tobacco industry in Ontario, whether or not the raw leaf tobacco is grown in Ontario. Under the Raw Leaf Tobacco Program, the Ministry issues registration certificates and carries out inspections and investigations as required. The *Tobacco Tax Act* requires all entities involved in the raw leaf tobacco industry to hold a registration certificate issued by the Ministry of Finance, and to deal only with other entities that hold the appropriate registration certificate issued under the *Tobacco Tax Act*. The Ministry of Finance maintains a listing of raw leaf registrants.

Analysis and Conclusion

- [28] In addition to the Statement of Claim, ████████ served and filed a number of other documents dated September 17, 2019 that reference the Court File Number noted above.
- [29] I shall deal with each of these documents in turn. In order to appreciate in detail the nature and content of the documents served and filed, I have also attached and marked them as Schedules to this Ruling.

(a) The Statement of Claim

- [30] Brent’s attempt to control the process is evident on the face of the Statement of Claim.
- [31] It is important to recognize that the objective of a Statement of Claim is to set out for the opposing parties and the Court and others:
- (a) the legal identity of the parties involved;
 - (b) a summary of the facts supporting the aggrieved party’s complaint;
 - (c) details of and in support of the pleaded facts;
 - (d) the legal basis for the action;

⁴ www.fin.gov.on.ca

- (e) the nature and extent of the damages alleged to have been suffered by the aggrieved person; and
- (f) the remedy sought by the aggrieved person.

- [32] The significance of these requirements cannot be overstated for it is only as a result of compliance with these principles of drafting pleadings that other parties are able to know and understand the person in opposition and the case he/she has to meet.
- [33] With respect to the Statement of Claim served and filed by [REDACTED] I make the following observations.
- [34] Firstly, in view of the fact that I preside in this Region and have frequently presided in St. Thomas, it is reasonable for me to take judicial notice of the fact that there is no court in St. Thomas at that address that is identified as [REDACTED] Court”.
- [35] Secondly, notwithstanding access to the forms prescribed under the Rules, [REDACTED] has changed the names of the roles ascribed to the parties to suit his own purpose. In the ordinary course, for example, the concept of “prosecutor” is reserved for counsel who are retained to pursue criminal or legislative infractions. The first party in a civil action is referred to in Canada as a Plaintiff. In this way, the distinction in the roles allows the public to readily determine the nature of the legal action.
- [36] I also find that the reference to the gender of the parties in the style of cause is entirely irrelevant and in my view, by making the gender of each person an apparent issue, borders on an affront to the administration of justice.
- [37] The Notice in the Statement of Claim is both misleading and wrong in law. As I have indicated, (a) there is no such court as a [REDACTED] Court’; (b) the *Rules of Civil Procedure* apply to all civil proceedings in Ontario; (c) the appeal process cannot be unilaterally prohibited or waived in these circumstances; and (d) judgment will not necessarily be granted in the absence of a defence.
- [38] In summary, I find that the statements in this Notice undermine the administration of justice by leading the recipient to believe that he/she does not have access to an identified legal process under the law such as the right of appeal and/or the protection of an orderly and fair administration of justice founded on the Rules of Civil Procedure.
- [39] I also note that the statement that a “trial by jury has commenced” is patently false. Time for a response by the Defendants has not yet expired let alone a trial commenced.
- [40] In my view, the allegations contained in the Statement of Claim are devoid of any explanation of the legal framework in which [REDACTED] worked in the Raw Leaf Tobacco industry or whether he was in compliance with the regulations set out by the Ministry.
- [41] The details provided are convoluted and confusing.

- [42] Further, although there is a reference to the law of contract, there are no details allowing identification of the alleged contract (or its terms and provision) entered into with the Defendants/Wrongdoer(s).
- [43] As in *Van Sluytman v. Muskoka (District Municipality)*, 2018 ONCA 32, I find that [REDACTED] pleadings, “fail to contain any coherent narrative or a concise statement of the material facts in support of the wrongs sought to be alleged. Instead, they contain rambling discourse, impermissible attachments or corollary documents, grandiose complaints, and repeated bald assertions.”
- [44] Throughout the Statement of Claim and corollary documents served and filed by [REDACTED] he has either intentionally or otherwise repeatedly misused legal and other technical terms. I use the word “intentionally” in this case because it is clear that [REDACTED] is aware of the *Rules of Civil Procedure*, for example, but believes that they ought not to apply to him.
- [45] In his notice contained in the Statement of Claim, [REDACTED] has misled the parties he has purported to sue by declaring that they have no right of appeal. The fact that he even mentions the concept of an “appeal” belies, in my view, his knowledge of at least the opportunity and/or right to appeal in Ontario.

(b) Notice: Liability ⁵

- [46] The purpose of this document is entirely unclear. It does not make sense. Above the title are the words (Do Not Trespass on the case). I have no idea what this means. A review of this Notice appears to be little more than a rambling demand for a public hearing and ends with a threat that “Liability [Trespass on the case] occurs if any [wo]man ignore RIGHTS of the people”.
- [47] The document is purportedly “signed” by [REDACTED] by way of a partial fingerprint in red ink.

(c) Claim: Trespass ⁶

- [48] The purpose of this document is equally unclear and confusing. [REDACTED] refers to a “court of record” and [REDACTED] Court” as if they are one and the same and then states as follows ““i: [REDACTED] family”...moving under the common law with a trial by jury [not jury trial] is invoked.”
- [49] It is entirely unclear what [REDACTED] meant in this statement.
- [50] This document is also purportedly signed by [REDACTED] by way of a smudged fingerprint in red ink.

(d) Notice: Characteristics of party ⁷

⁵ Schedule “B”

⁶ Schedule “C”

⁷ Schedule “D”

[51] In my view, this document amounts to little more than a blatant attempt to insert personal control over the parties and the Court.

(e) Notice: court, Court, COURT⁸

[52] This document appears to be a notice or warning to the Court that [REDACTED] will not be pursuing this litigation in accordance with the *Rules of Civil Procedure*; that he has only used forms for the ease of the Court clerks; and, that given that he is not a member of the Law Society (nor does he apparently wish to be), he sees no benefit in complying with the Rules .

(f) Notice: Jurisdiction⁹

[53] It is difficult to discern the purpose of this document. The contents appear to amount to a list of definitions and declarations by [REDACTED]

[54] Again, unfortunately, [REDACTED] appears to either not understand the civil litigation process in the administration of justice in Ontario or, if he does, refuses or declines to adhere to its traditions and practice. It appears, for example, that he seeks to establish his own alternate court of legal process. He writes in the notice that he pays “money into public courthouses to hold court and access justice”; that [REDACTED] Court’ is a “court of record”; and, that in a “court of record”, the tribunal is independent of the magistrate.

[55] This document also appears to be a further notice or warning to the Court as well as others that the presiding judge has or will have no jurisdiction over his claims when he writes, “No [wo]man, nor person within or outside of this Courthouse, has the capacity to interfere; amend; alter; modify; interpret; deny my claim, prior to a verdict tendered from a jury”.

[56] This bald assertion is incorrect both in fact and in law.

[57] This document is purported to be signed by [REDACTED] by way of a faint, indiscernible and partial fingerprint in red ink.

(g) Notice: Venue¹⁰

[58] Given the title and contents of this document, it is assumed that Mr. [REDACTED] seeks to notify the opposing parties that he wishes to have this matter heard in St. Thomas. Once again, he refers, however, to a concept of the [REDACTED] Court’ as being located at the Courthouse in St. Thomas.

[59] There is no such Court.

(h) Notice: Verifications¹¹

⁸ Schedule “E”

⁹ Schedule “F”

¹⁰ Schedule “G”

[60] The purpose of this document is unknown and not readily discernible other than perhaps as an attempt by [REDACTED] to control how documentary evidence is filed, marked and received by the [REDACTED] Court’.

(i) Notice: ‘right to pursue a claim’¹²

[61] This notice is nothing more than an instruction or demand to the Superior Court that the administrative office in the Superior Court of Justice at St. Thomas not allow anyone to interfere with Mr. [REDACTED] court and his perceived right to prosecute his case in a public building.

(j) Notice: trespass on the case¹³

[62] The purpose of this document, in my view, is nothing more than a misguided or blatant attempt to control the process in St. Thomas including the jurisdiction of a Justice of the Peace, Her Worship Cheri Emrich who presides there.

(k) Notice: ‘Proof of Service’¹⁴

[63] This document purports to be an alternative to an Affidavit of Service and is signed by way of fingerprint in red ink but unsworn.

(l) Statement of Truth¹⁵

[64] There are five documents entitled “Statement of Truth” which appear to be sworn Affidavits of a person identified as Lizette Mouthon Franco, who has deposed that she served Dean Eastman, Rod Phillips, Doug Downey, Deon Cousins and Jeff Quann, by mail.

[65] I further find that the documents filed by [REDACTED] including the Statement of Claim contain primarily a rambling enunciation of demands both in substance and form that fail to identify the issues and/or the facts necessary to defend against the complaint(s) Mr. [REDACTED] seeks to advance.

Conclusion

[66] As I indicated above, the availability of a dismissal to the requesting party, is dependent on the abusive nature of the proceeding being apparent on the face of the pleadings themselves. In this Ruling, I have referred only to the wording in the documents themselves.

[67] In my view, this is one of the “clearest of cases” referred to above. The documents filed by [REDACTED] indicate,

¹¹ Schedule “H”

¹² Schedule “I”

¹³ Schedule “J”

¹⁴ Schedule “K”

¹⁵ Schedule “L”

(a) an attempt by him to establish an alternative litigation process (the [REDACTED] Court”) within a “public building”, namely, the Superior Court of Justice in St. Thomas; and,

(b) a further attempt to oust the *Rules* and control the process according to his personal preferences.

[68] All Canadians have a right to *participation* in the justice system in compliance with the Rules and the law. But the system itself has also been designed to apply *equally* to *all* Canadians and can therefore only be controlled, changed or amended in accordance with the process established by law and not by personal preference.

[69] In summary, the action commenced by [REDACTED] as it is currently constituted is dismissed as necessary in the interest of justice. The approach adopted by [REDACTED] in this proceeding toward both the administration of justice and the named defendants who were (a) referred to by their gender and as “Wrongdoers”; and (b) misled by assertive statements that were wrong in law, leans toward the abusive in character. It appears that he is attempting to establish his own legal or court system by way of access to a public building in which is housed the Superior Court of Justice.

[70] My opinion is bolstered by the contents of a faxed letter dated November 5, 2019 from [REDACTED] in response to the request for dismissal by letter received from counsel for the Ministry. For the sake of completeness, I have attached both letters as Schedule “M”.

[71] In his response, [REDACTED] has written as follows:

I just received a communication attached November 4th, 2019 from a man Erik [Wagner];

I, require the immediate removal of said letter from [REDACTED] Court File: CV 19-00000081 as this man has no standing or jurisdiction to trespass on my case as per my honourable Notices establishing said court:

Notices I court filing [statement of claim] are crystal clear to jurisdiction and wrongdoer[s] served;

Notice: Liability page 1

“7. No [wo]man at said courthouse can administrate my property [filing] without right”

This man [Gary] is ‘trespassing on the case’ requiring attention;

I, thank you for your time and attention to correct said ‘trespass’ at this time.

[72] That said, it appears that [REDACTED] may have a complaint that may be worthy of review and consideration by a court of competent jurisdiction. If I have been able to discern the basic nature of [REDACTED] complaint correctly, it appears that goods owned by [REDACTED] were seized by the Ministry of Finance while in transit for a failure by [REDACTED] to comply with rules and regulations of the Raw Leaf Tobacco Program.

[73] If this is [REDACTED] complaint and he seeks to challenge the actions of the Ministry, he should not be deprived of the opportunity to do so.

[74] For all of these reasons, the following is my order:

Order

[75] The action commenced in the Superior Court of Justice in St. Thomas, Ontario that has been identified as CV 81/19 or CV 19-00000081 and in which the first party is identified as "i: man: [REDACTED] family" and as a "Prosecutor" and the second parties are identified as "Rod Phillips: a man; Doug Downey: a man; Dean Eastman: a man; Deon Cousins: a woman and Jeff Quann: a man" and further identified as "Wrongdoer(s)", is dismissed.

[76] Subject to the order below, the dismissal of this action is without prejudice to the right of [REDACTED] family to commence a proceeding that complies with the *Courts of Justice Act* R.R.O. 1990, Regulation 194, *Rules Of Civil Procedure*.

[77] No proceeding, however, may be commenced by or pleading(s) issued by the Superior Court of Ontario for, a person known as [REDACTED] family" or [REDACTED] [REDACTED] against any person named herein including but not limited to the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of the Attorney General unless and until the pleadings submitted comply in full with the *Courts of Justice Act* R.R.O. 1990, Regulation 194 *Rules Of Civil Procedure*.

[78] In all of the circumstances, there will be no costs.

Justice L. Templeton
Justice L. C. Templeton

Released: November 7, 2019

Exhibit #3

From:	
Fax:	
Phone:	

FAX

To: Kim (the honorable woman who sometimes acts as Registrar for the Superior Court of Justice)

Fax: 1.519.633.4925

Phone: 1.519.631.4810

Pages: 8 (including this cover page)

RE: **TRESPASS ON THE CASE [Court File No. 19-00000081]
NOTICE[S]**

Good day Kim,

i, require these notices are read and forward immediately to the public servants, a woman: Lynda [C. Templeton] and a man: Scott [K. Campbell] who removed my property without right;

i, require a written reply verifiable 'findings of facts and conclusions in law' with wet signature from Lynda and Scott if my NOTICES not be true.

i, require from Kim the name of WHEN and WHO 'trespassed on my Case' willfully ignoring all honorable notices in my case file insuring such a corrupt act would NEVER occur. It was clear by your response during call you placed in front of me on November 7th 2019 that my property was no longer in the building under your control and Kim did not know this trespass occurred until the call was placed.

Kind Regards,

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY: The information contained in this facsimile message is intended only for the use of the man or woman named above. If the reader of this message IS NOT 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 immediately notify us by telephone and return the original message to us. Thank you.

in
[REDACTED] Court'
at
Superior Court of Justice
Elgin County Courthouse
4 Wellington Street
St. Thomas ON N5R 2P2

i: man : [REDACTED]

Prosecutor

Rod Phillips: a man;
Doug Downey: a man;
Dean Eastman: a man;
Deon Cousins: a woman;
Jeff Quann: a man;

Wrongdoer(s)

Notice: court; Court; COURT:

The [REDACTED] Court presents notice:

- Firstly: i, do/did not surrender my case to act under '*Rules of Civil Procedure*'
- Secondly: Court is under control to the law, common to the people, from within this district [common law]
- Thirdly: The jury of my peers will judge the matters of the law, which *Court* lays before them;
- Fourthly: i, a man not bound to 'Rules of Civil Procedure', Rules promulgated by a Legal Society in which
i, am not a member, nor wish to be
- Fifthly: i, say here, and will verify in open court, that all herein be true



Date: November 8th 2019

in
[REDACTED] Court
at
Superior Court of Justice
Elgin County Courthouse
4 Wellington Street
St. Thomas ON N5R 2P2

i: man : [REDACTED]

Prosecutor

Rod Phillips: a man;
Doug Downey: a man;
Dean Eastman: a man;
Deon Cousins: a woman;
Jeff Quann: a man;

Wrongdoer(s)

Notice: Agents of SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE:

The [REDACTED] Court presents Notice:

- Firstly: SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE agents work with GOVERNMENT OF ONTARIO agents;
- Secondly: There is a clear and disturbing 'conflict of interest' as, a woman: Lynda (C. Templeton) and a man: Scott [K. Campbell] act as, agents working with a man: Doug Downey [agent] who controls other agents [crown attorneys] who work closely with 'Ministry of Finance' agents: wrongdoers [Rod, Dean, Deon, Jeff within my verified claim sworn under affirmation Sept 17th 2019];
- Thirdly: i, require immediate restoration of property [filing] to St. Thomas 'Superior Court of Justice';
- Fourthly: i, have the [inherent]: capacity; power; right; authority to summon any wrongdoer [viz., agents of SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE and GOVERNMENT OF ONTARIO] into a 'court of record', have whomever tried before a 'trial by jury';
- Fifthly: i, claim wrong and harm has now occurred all agents of both service corporations are to stop;
- Sixthly: i, say here, and will verify in open court, that all herein be true;

[REDACTED]



Date: November 8th 2019

in
[REDACTED] Court'
at
Superior Court of Justice
Elgin County Courthouse
4 Wellington Street
St. Thomas ON N5R 2P2

i: man : [REDACTED]

Prosecutor

Rod Phillips: a man;
Doug Downey: a man;
Dean Eastman: a man;
Deon Cousins: a woman;
Jeff Quann: a man;

Wrongdoer(s)

Notice: Characteristic of party;

Common parlance / LEGALESE

The [REDACTED] Court presents Notice:

- Firstly: i, have received communications and it appears a woman: Lynda C. Templeton who acts for a service corporation [GOVERNMENT OF ONTARIO] is attempting to communicate to i, a man in a language foreign to me, i, believe it is called 'legalese';
- Secondly: i, do not have to attempt to decipher such incantations, for my 'case' [property] lies in 'Superior Court of Justice' a 'court of record', which converses in words found amongst the people;
- Thirdly: There is no *law* in which i, subscribe to, which compels me to accept; translate; decipher, or make use of my limited and valuable resources upon documents tendered in *Legalese*;
- Fourthly: i, do not lower my status to that of an attorney, for i, will stand in open court and affirm all i, said as on September 17th 2019 before a woman: Cheri who acts as 'Justice of the Peace', on public record;
- Fifthly: By the verified trespass and actions of a man: Scott [K. Campbell] and a woman: Lynda [C. Templeton], proves it is necessary and proper for a 'trial by jury' to, commence posthaste;
- Sixthly: i, will swear under oath or affirmation that all herein be true;


Date: November 8th 2019

in
[REDACTED] Court'
at
Superior Court of Justice
Elgin County Courthouse
4 Wellington Street
St. Thomas ON N5R 2P2

i: man : [REDACTED]

Prosecutor

Rod Phillips: a man;
Doug Downey: a man;
Dean Eastman: a man;
Deon Cousins: a woman;
Jeff Quann: a man;

Wrongdoer(s)

Notice: laches;

The [REDACTED] Court presents Notice:

Firstly: i, declare as a man, i am not bound by legalese laches;

NO LACHES can be imputed to the public.
4 Mass. Rep. 522; 3 Serg. & Rawle, 291; 4
Henn. & Munf. 57; 1 Penna. R. 476. Vide 1
Supp. to Ves. Jr. 436; 2 Id. 170; Dane's Ab.
Index, h. t.; 4 Bouv. Inst. n. 3911.

Secondly: i, do not converse in legalese, nor is there a law which claims i, must in order to pursue a claim
through a public [Superior Court of Justice] venue;

Thirdly: i, say here, and will verify in open court, that all herein be true;

[REDACTED]

[Fingerprint]

Date: November 8th 2019

in
[REDACTED] Court'
at
Superior Court of Justice
Elgin County Courthouse
4 Wellington Street
St. Thomas ON N5R 2P2

i: man : [REDACTED]

Prosecutor

Rod Phillips: a man;
Doug Downey: a man;
Dean Eastman: a man;
Deon Cousins: a woman;
Jeff Quann: a man;

Wrongdoer(s)

Notice: nature of party;
Common parlance / LEGALESE

The [REDACTED] Court presents Notice:

Firstly: i, declare that the nature of the party who presents *his* case, before court, is a man;

Secondly: i, say here, and will verify in open court, that all herein be true;



Date: November 8th 2019

Court File No: CV-19-00000081-0000

in
[REDACTED] Court'
at
Superior Court of Justice
Elgin County Courthouse
4 Wellington Street
St. Thomas ON N5R 2P2

i: man : [REDACTED]

Prosecutor

Rod Phillips: a man;
Doug Downey: a man;
Dean Eastman: a man;
Deon Cousins: a woman;
Jeff Quann: a man;

Wrongdoer(s)

Notice: 'right to pursue a claim'

In regards to Notice: 'right to pursue a claim'

i, a man, now require of the 'Office of the Court Clerk', for the 'Superior Court of Justice',
restore my property [CV-19-00000081-0000] post haste;

[REDACTED]

Date: November 8th 2019

in

██████████ Court'

at

Superior Court of Justice
Elgin County Courthouse
4 Wellington Street
St. Thomas ON N5R 2P2

i: man :

██

Prosecutor

Rod Phillips: a man;
Doug Downey: a man;
Dean Eastman: a man;
Deon Cousins: a woman;
Jeff Quann: a man;

Wrongdoer(s)

Notice

The ██████████ Court delivers Notice:

i, a man declare: any interference of; for, or; with the enjoyment of [my] property
[the exercise of rights(s)], by any qualified employee, of court, will be held liable for damages
due to injury and/or harm, resulting from or arising out of ANY tortuous act, error, or omission
of the individual ['trespass on the Case'];

i, will require; compensation of one-dollar for every second (viz., moment in time) for ANY trespass;

i, trust this is clear to all involved ['trespass on the Case'] that occurred before November 7th 2019;

i, require immediate restoration of property to St. Thomas 'Superior Court of Justice' to avoid liability;



██

Date: November 8th 2019