MOTION TO ADDUCE FRESH EVIDENCE FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

IN THE
COURT OF APPEAL FOR SASKATCHEWAN
CASE No. CACV3708
FEBURARY 16, 2021

In The Court of Appeal for Saskatchewan

ROBERT A. CANNON

Appellant,

On behalf of



KARIS K.N. RICHARDSON

Detainee,

V.

COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH FOR SASKATCHEWAN,
HONOURABLE J.W. ELSON,
THE BATTLEFORDS SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST CHURCH,
MATRIX LAW GROUP,
PATRICIA J. MEIKLEJOHN,
CLIFFORD HOLM,
ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE,
KIMBERLEY RICHARDSON, ET AL.

Respondents.

Motion to Adduce Fresh Evidence for a Writ of Habeas Corpus

ROBERT A. CANNON 1102 Ave L North,

Saskatoon, SK S7L 2S1, Canada

Tel: 1 306 480-9473

Email: robert.cannon@usask.ca

I. INTRODUCTION

- 1. This Motion to Adduce Fresh Evidence for a Writ of Habeas Corpus ("Motion for Fresh Evidence") is filed by Robert A. Cannon (the "Appellant") on behalf of Karis K.N.

 Richardson (the "Detainee") against the Masonic conspirators which are using their authority to unlawfully detain her to torture her and her father Dale J.S. Richardson ("Dale") to distract from and hinder an investigation into Innovation Credit Union for the criminal involvement of many of its rogue agents in the mismanagement of the Covid emergency perpetuated by without limitation the Saskatchewan Health Authority and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police; such Masonic conspirators specifically include: Court of Queen's Bench for Saskatchewan, Justice R.W. Elson of such court, the Battlefords Seventh-Day Adventist Church, Matrix Law Group LLP, Patricia J. Meiklejohn and Clifford A. Holm of such law firm, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Kimberley A. Richardson, et al. (each a "Respondent", and collectively, the "Respondents"). Justice N.D. Crooks of the Court of Queen's Bench for Saskatchewan (the "Superior Court") and Justice J.A. Schwann and Justice J.A. Caldwell of this Court are also directly implicated, although not Respondents.
- 2. Specifically, this *Motion for Fresh Evidence* seeks to adduce fresh evidence which will impact an impartial decision by this Court, if impartiality were possible, namely:
 - (i) transcript of Chad Gartner on behalf of Innovation Credit Union and Dale on behalf of DSR Karis Consulting Inc. ("DSR Karis") which is the exclusive property of DSR Karis pursuant to clause 9 of the Non-Disclosure Agreement between Innovation Credit Union and DSR Karis, an agreement that Innovation Credit Union breached and a major reason Dale and his daughters Kaysha F.N. Dery ("Kaysha") and the Detainee were kidnapped pursuant to fraudulent court orders and the reason subsequent requests for investigations were dismissed by the Superior Court and suspended by this Court and courts abroad (see Appendix A on page 1a);
 - (ii) the Ex Parte Motion for Leave to Appeal to the Supreme Court for Writ of Habeas Corpus and its appendices submitted on January 29 of this year to this Court and the QUEEN'S PRIVY COUNSEL FOR CANADA given the prejudice of this Court and the resulting decision, such appendices include without limitation an Ex Parte & Pro Se Original Application for World Writ of Habeas Corpus in the International Criminal Court, and evidence of the Supreme Court of the United States arbitrarily suspending the Privilege of Writ of Habeas Corpus as part of a Masonic conspiracy to cover up criminal and terrorist activity in both Canada and the United States (see Appendix D on page 57a);

- (iii) photo and transcript evidence of the arbitrary, unconstitutional, and unlawful detainment of Christy Dawn Pembrun ("Christy") which is the first independent party to be punished for Dale's actions (see Appendix B on page 17a); and
- (iv) the arbitrary suspension of the *Privilege of Writ of Habeas Corpus* by the UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA on the basis of falsehood purporting without limitation the unauthorized practice of law to *threaten*, *coerce*, and *punish* the *Appellant*, a seemingly common trend in both CANADA and the UNITED STATES with respect to the CHRISTIAN right of the *Privilege of Writ of Habeas Corpus* (see Appendix C on page 30a).
- 3. This motion is made pursuant to section 59 of the rules of this Court and requests waiving compliance with such rules for the foregoing where needed pursuant to subsection 4(1) of such rules given such motion is made to uphold the "supremacy of God and the rule of law".
- 4. The evidence specified in paragraph 2 and its subparagraphs above are all *relevant* to this appeal as it demonstrates a pattern of behaviour to cover up crime and suspend the justice thereof that transcends national boundaries which is demonstrated herein. This behaviour is to be expected of a transnational organization, the Masons and their conspirators, which appears to have assumed control of a bank to *hide* and *fund* its criminal and terrorist activities both in Canada and abroad. To disprove and alleviate this serious concern, only an investigation was to be requested; instead, Dale who was to request such investigation on behalf of DSR Karis was kidnapped in front of the Superior Court in the Judicial Centre of Battleford on July 23 of last year by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and subsequently strapped to a bed a drugged against his will while the case was suspended *sine die* by a corrupt judge, Justice R.W. Elson. This evidence could not have, by due diligence, been adduced at trial as the evidence from subparagraph (ii) and (iv) did not exist at that time, the *Appellant* was not authorized to include subparagraph (ii) the evidence from subparagraph (iii) was omitted in error as pointed out by Justice N.D. Crooks and the Attorney General of Canada.
- 5. The Appellant would like to direct attention to paragraph 7 of the factum of LYNN CONNELLY on behalf of the ATTORNEY GENERAL OF SASKATCHEWAN in which she purported "This Court does not have the benefit of evidence that might have been brought in support of such a challenge had it been properly introduced at first instance." and in paragraph 6 purported that "The questions of statutory validly do not relate in any meaningful way to the decision being appealed."; despite her frivolous and vexatious claims to strike down remedy including without limitation statutory revision of the constitutional questions which challenge without limitation The Mental Health Services Act and The Public Health Act, 1994 which permits forced medical treatment, the fresh evidence brought forward in this motion from paragraph 2 and its subparagraphs will definitely ensure that this Court has the benefit of evidence to recognize its prejudice and refer all determinations to the

SUPREME COURT OF CANADA including without limitation the decision that *forced medical treatment* is unconstitutional and should be *statutorily revised* and that the *Writ of Habeas Corpus* be issued.

II. ARGUMENTS

A. Impartiality of the Appellant

- The Appellant is the only impartial party in these proceedings including the justices and opposing counsel, the Appellant is receiving no selfish benefit or remuneration of any kind, and is pursing litigation as part of his "Christian duty". Furthermore, in the coarse of exercising his "Christian duty", the Appellant bore witness to the MASONIC conspiracy purported by JESUIT affiliated CARLO MARIA VIGANÒ, Titular Archbishop of Ulpiana, about how the mismanagement of the Covid emergency is being used to build a world without freedom through the dissolution of social order: Solve et Coagula as the Masonic adage teaches.
- The Appellant, a Bible believing SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST which advocates the Spirit of Prophecy, is the most qualified individual to bare witness to this MASONIC conspiracy which is in direct opposition to the papacy as the SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST doctrine advocates the papacy is the little horn of Daniel 7 which is the devil's enterprise; the Appellant has no reason to advocate the papacy, thereby its judgments are impartial. GoD's wrath is about to poured out on the law breaking MASONIC conspirators without measure, by strengthening its worst enemy, the papacy, to punish them.
- 8. The Appellant would like to direct attention to the following paragraphs from Chapter 12 The French Reformation of The Great Controversy by ELLEN G. WHITE with respect to the familiarity of GoD's people with persecution, torture, and the ultimate failure of wicked because GoD always wins:

But as dangers thickened, Berquin's zeal only waxed the stronger. So far from adopting the politic and self-serving counsel of Erasmus, he determined upon still bolder measures. He would not only stand in defense of the truth, but he would attack error. The charge of heresy which the Romanists were seeking to fasten upon him, he would rivet upon them. The most active and bitter of his opponents were the learned doctors and monks of the theological department in the great University of Paris, one of the highest ecclesiastical authorities both in the city and the nation. From the writings of these doctors, Berquin drew twelve propositions which he publicly declared to be "opposed to the Bible, and heretical;" and he appealed to the king to act as judge in the controversy. {GC 216.3}

The monarch, not loath to bring into contrast the power and acuteness of the opposing champions, and glad of an opportunity of humbling the pride of these haughty monks, bade the Romanists defend their cause by the Bible. This

weapon, they well knew, would avail them little; imprisonment, torture, and the stake were arms which they better understood how to wield. Now the tables were turned, and they saw themselves about to fall into the pit into which they had hoped to plunge Berquin. In amazement they looked about them for some way of escape. {GC 217.1}

..

At the stake, Berquin endeavored to address a few words to the people; but the monks, fearing the result, began to shout, and the soldiers to clash their arms, and their clamor drowned the martyr's voice. Thus in 1529 the highest literary and ecclesiastical authority of cultured Paris "set the populace of 1793 the base example of stifling on the scaffold the sacred words of the dying."—Ibid., b. 13, ch. 9. {GC 218.3}

Berquin was strangled, and his body was consumed in the flames. The tidings of his death caused sorrow to the friends of the Reformation throughout France. But his example was not lost. "We, too, are ready," said the witnesses for the truth, "to meet death cheerfully, setting our eyes on the life that is to come."—
D'Aubigne, History of the Reformation in Europe in the Time of Calvin, b. 2, ch. 16. {GC 218.4}

. . .

The victims were put to death with cruel torture, it being specially ordered that the fire should be lowered in order to prolong their agony. But they died as conquerors. Their constancy was unshaken, their peace unclouded. Their persecutors, powerless to move their inflexible firmness, felt themselves defeated. "The scaffolds were distributed over all the quarters of Paris, and the burnings followed on successive days, the design being to spread the terror of heresy by spreading the executions. The advantage, however, in the end, remained with the gospel. All Paris was enabled to see what kind of men the new opinions could produce. There was no pulpit like the martyr's pile. The serene joy that lighted up the faces of these men as they passed along ... to the place of execution, their heroism as they stood amid the bitter flames, their meek forgiveness of injuries, transformed, in instances not a few, anger into pity, and hate into love, and pleaded with resistless eloquence in behalf of the gospel."—Wylie, b. 13, ch. 20. {GC 226.1}

• • •

The Reformation had presented to the world an open Bible, unsealing the precepts of the law of God and urging its claims upon the consciences of the people. Infinite Love had unfolded to men the statutes and principles of heaven. God had said: "Keep therefore and do them; for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the nations, which shall hear all these statutes, and say, Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people." Deuteronomy 4:6. When France rejected the gift of heaven, she sowed the seeds of anarchy

and ruin; and the inevitable outworking of cause and effect resulted in the Revolution and the Reign of Terror. {GC 230.3}

B. Superior Court Punishing the Impartial Appellant

- 9. The *Appellant* would like to direct attention to the eighth order for "costs payable by the applicant in the amount of \$500.00" of JUSTICE N.D. CROOKS which was intended to *punish* the *Appellant* for filing, in his own name, the *Application for a Writ of Habeas Corpus Ad Subjiciendum* and, more importantly, requesting an investigation into INNOVATION CREDIT UNION which JUSTICE N.D. CROOKS selectively ignored terming it a "variety of grievances held primarily by Mr. Richardson and Ms. Dery".
- 10. The Appellant would like to direct attention to the sixth order for dispensing with the habeas corpus of JUSTICE N.D. CROOKS and the omitted ground (d) directly following a threat in ground (c) under the guise of "I would caution Mr. Cannon that he may want to review The Legal Profession Act, 1990, SS 1990-91, c L-10.1, and the restrictions on acting on behalf of another party, particularly where remuneration is sought."
- 11. The *Appellant* would like to direct attention to all orders of JUSTICE N.D. CROOKS being prepared prior to the hearing in chambers and that a ground for dispensing with the application was omitted; such omission suggests that her orders prepared *prior* to the *improper* trial may have been influenced by the only three substantial statements the *Appellant* was permitted to speak before JUSTICE N.D. CROOKS made her orders in chambers and promptly *fled* the court room. The *Appellant* purported the following three substantial statements:
 - (i) that orders for Writ of Habeas Corpus made on behalf of DALE, KAYSHA, CHRISTY, and the Detainee were made pursuant to 3-64(2) of The Queen's Bench Rules which specifies that "Any person is entitled to bring proceedings, on his or her own behalf or on behalf of any other person, to obtain an order of habeas corpus ad subjiciendum.";
 - (ii) that DALE, considering his release and presence in the court room, should be given privilege to speak on his own behalf pursuant to 3-64(3) of *The Queen's Bench Rules* which specifies that "If an application is brought by a person on behalf of another person, the Court may determine which of the applicant or the subject of the application is to have the carriage of the proceedings." which was denied; and
 - (iii) that DALE was strapped to a table and drugged against his will which the application purported was torture under the UNITED NATIONS Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (the "UN Torture Convention").

- 12. The *Privilege of Writ of Habeas Corpus* guarantees that "You shall have the body" and when an *Application for a Writ of Habeas Corpus* is submitted to a court, justice, or judge on your behalf, the same shall forthwith direct the Writ to any person who has seized or imprisoned you, such person must bring or cause your body to be brought before the same within three days, unless distance requires additional time, for an investigation into the lawfulness of your seizure or imprisonment.
- 13. The Appellant would like to direct attention to the judgment of JUSTICE N.D. CROOKS of the SUPERIOR COURT in which she purported that "The application for habeas corpus is moot. There is no deprivation of the applicant's liberty that would trigger habeas corpus."; the Appellant agrees that the application and all orders therein were commenced and prosecuted by the "applicant" in his own name, however, disagrees that "The application for habeas corpus is moot" as the following orders for Writ of Habeas Corpus where made pursuant to section 3-64(2) of The Queen's Bench Rules, namely:
 - 26. The Writ of *Habeas Corpus ad subjiciendum* will be directed to the Respondents and to all officers and employees of the Respondents who have Dale Richardson, Kaysha Dery, Karis Richardson, or Christy Dawn Pembrun in their charge or detained in their custody by whatever name he or she may be called to have Dale Richardson, Kaysha Dery, Karis Richardson, and Christy Dawn Pembrun before a judge in chambers at the Court House, Court of Queen's Bench, Judicial Center of Saskatoon, 520 Spadina Crescent E, Saskatoon, S7K 3G7, Saskatchewan immediately, that this Court may then and there examine and determine the validity of that detention.
 - 27. For the forgoing, that Dale Richardson, Kaysha Dery, Karis Richardson, and Christy Dawn Pembrun be brought in person before such judge in chambers at the Court House, Court of Queen's Bench, Judicial Center of Saskatoon, 520 Spadina Crescent E, Saskatoon, S7K 3G7.
- 14. The Appellant would like to direct attention to the judgment of JUSTICE N.D. CROOKS of the SUPERIOR COURT in which she purported that "The relief that is sought is far beyond the scope of habeas corpus. It incorporates a number of third-party grievances against a vast range of respondents for a broad array of allegations." In addition to applying for a Writ of Habeas Corpus for DALE, KAYSHA, CHRISTY, and the Detainee pursuant to subsection 3-64(2) of The Queen's Bench Rules, the Appellant was representing himself in his own name, for an investigation into INNOVATION CREDIT UNION and relating protective orders to ensure the integrity of such investigation and these orders were in no way "relief" for habeas corpus as they were clearly not in "the scope of habeas corpus", specifically orders 28 to 36.
- 15. The *Appellant* is a managerial accountant with published research into transparent money management systems, and when he witnessed DALE and his daughter KAYSHA being kidnapped

in front the SUPERIOR COURT as an act of terrorism when DALE was to appear on behalf of DSR KARIS, an *essential service*, to request an investigation into INNOVATION CREDIT UNION, a credit union with poor accounting controls and potential for fraud and funding of terrorism, he who was also a member of INNOVATION CREDIT UNION requested to see an investigation and ensure that such investigation was conducted with integrity; clearly JUSTICE N.D. CROOKS disagreed and by her actions declared she was terrorist by law as "severe interference with or disruption of an essential service" is terrorism under the *Criminal Code*.

- 16. The Appellant would like to direct attention to how JUSTICE N.D. CROOKS in her judgment conveniently did not mention how the "costs shall be paid in non-refundable advances of \$500,000 cash starting with a \$2,000,000 cash non-refundable retainer or as the court determines reasonable" was to be paid to an investigator appointed under The Credit Union Act, 1998 and it was another order which requested the "appointment of an impartial investigator, Wisework Consulting Inc. represented by Robert Cannon, that has demonstrated their impartiality and is not foreign to the Dale Richardson, Kaysha Dery, and Karis Richardson", namely:
 - (c) Mr. Cannon is not a lawyer and relies on his "Christian duty" in bringing this application; however, the application seeks substantial financial remuneration payable to the corporation he represents, starting "a \$2,000,000 cash non-refundable retainer". I would caution Mr. Cannon that he may want to review The Legal Profession Act, 1990, SS 1990-91, c L-10.1, and the restrictions on acting on behalf of another party, particularly where remuneration is sought.
- 17. The Appellant would like to direct attention to subsection 349(1) of The Credit Union Act, 1998 with respect to the foregoing request for an investigation and relating protective orders to ensure the integrity of such investigation, specifically orders 28 to 36, which were not requested as relief in the appeal to this Court as such orders were not even possible to begin with as The Queen's Bench Rules requires that the Appellant apply in Saskatoon and the request could not be made when INNOVATION CREDIT UNION has no registered office in Saskatoon, namely:
 - **349(1)** On notice to the registrar and CUDGC and on any other notice that the court may require, a member may apply to the court at the judicial centre where the credit union has its registered office, for an order directing that an investigation be made of the credit union and any of its affiliates.
- 18. The investigation into INNOVATION CREDIT UNION for the criminal involvement of many of its *rogue* agents in the mismanagement of the Covid emergency perpetuated by without limitation the SASKATCHEWAN HEALTH AUTHORITY and the ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE was successfully hindered when the registered office of DSR KARIS was stolen, DALE and his daughter KAYSHA were kidnapped in front of the SUPERIOR COURT, and the court hearing requesting such investigation was suspended *sine die* meaning it could not be brought back without the consent of the respondents.

C. United States Punishing the Impartial Appellant

- 19. The SUPERIOR COURT, having suspended the Application for a Writ of Habeas Corpus Ad Subjiciendum, and with further expectation of punishment from this Court, KAYSHA decided to flee to the UNITED STATES on the basis of her Métis citizenship and undeniable right of abode in her ancestral homeland, especially considering the torture she was experiencing in CANADA; she was experiencing severe psychological suffering as she feared being taken without cause again to a maximum security prison for the criminally insane by ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE as the courts refused to punish their actions.
- 20. JONATHAN GRIWAC on behalf of UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY on behalf of the UNITED STATES at the border denied KAYSHA access to the UNITED STATES on the basis of being Métis and when she subsequently applied for asylum, attempted to threatened her with being taken into custody and to coerce her into returning to CANADA without filing asylum; KAYSHA, had more credible fear of being persecuted and tortured in CANADA than being taken to federal prison in the UNITED STATES, such asylum was from persecution based on race, religion, and political position with respect to the mismanagement of the Covid emergency, and torture pursuant to the UN Torture Convention which is binding in the UNITED STATES. KAYSHA is currently being held pursuant to the authority of the ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES and courts with corrupt officials.
- 21. The *Appellant* would like to direct attention to his arrest on January 4 of this year in the visitor entrance of the Cannon House Office Building of the UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, where he was attempting to submit a petition for the rights of the INDIGENOUS PEOPLES with respect to their persecution by MASONIC conspirators including without limitation JOSEPH R. BIDEN. The petition enclosed the *Ex Parte & Pro Se Original Application for Writ of Habeas Corpus* on behalf of KAYSHA in the SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES which was suspended. This final petition and its enclosures submitted to officials of the UNITED STATES was "answered only by repeated injury", in arresting the petitioner under the guise of the Covid emergency. Being refused aid from his CHRISTIAN homeland by corrupt officials, the *Appellant* set his sights back on CANADA to continue the legal battle for the freedom of the *Detainee* with the expectation of further injury.
- 22. The Ex Parte & Pro Se Original Application for World Writ of Habeas Corpus in the INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT which describes the arrest in paragraph 21 above and evidence of the SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES arbitrarily suspending the Privilege of Writ of Habeas Corpus which

[&]quot;In every stage of these Oppressions We have Petitioned for Redress in the most humble terms: Our repeated Petitions have been answered only by repeated injury. A Prince whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a Tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people." in the Declaration of Independence (US 1776).

are both specified in subparagraph 2(ii) demonstrates the *pattern of behaviour* evident in paragraph 20 and 21 above which is transnational in nature, to distract from and hinder an investigation into INNOVATION CREDIT UNION for the criminal involvement of many of its *rogue agents* in the mismanagement of the Covid emergency perpetuated by without limitation the SASKATCHEWAN HEALTH AUTHORITY and the ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE in Saskatchewan. If this self-evident case of mismanagement were properly investigated, it could lead others to question the transparency and potential mismanagement of the Covid emergency in other jurisdictions or even countries; hence, the importance of hiding it.

D. Attorney General of Canada Punishing the Impartial Appellant

- 23. The Appellant would like to direct attention to paragraph 44 in the factum of CHERYL GIESBRECHT on behalf of the ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA which requests that "that this Honourable Court dismiss the within appeal with costs" and paragraph 43 of the same stating "The Notice of Constitutional Question has no relevance to the Chambers judge's decision and should be disregarded." which was intended to punish the Appellant for filing, in his own name, the Application for a Writ of Habeas Corpus Ad Subjiciendum and exercising his rights to challenge the constitutionally of statutes and, more importantly, implicating INNOVATION CREDIT UNION in such investigation which the ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA selectively ignored when attempting to undermine his claims in paragraph 32 of the same as follows:
 - 32. The Appellant makes vague allegations that the "implementation" of The Mental Health Services Act and The Public Health Act, 1994 breach the Charter and "other laws and international law as well". The Factum characterizes the detentions as "arbitrary detainment[s] as part of torture, terrorism, genocide, and apartheid and the mismanagement of the Covid emergency" and calls the Chambers judge a terrorist. The Appellant largely relies on personal opinions, conspiratorial claims, and interpretation of religious texts.
- The Appellant would like to direct attention to argument one in the factum of CHERYL GIESBRECHT on behalf of the ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA where she clearly recognized that the *Detainee* "is in the custody of her mother, Kimberley Richardson" but refuses to test the validity of such custody purporting that "habeas corpus did not lie in the circumstances" and that she "supports the arguments and legal analysis in the SHA Factum and the factums of the other respondents submitted in this appeal in relation to the law on habeas corpus"; an investigation into the arbitrary detainment of the *Detainee* would trigger an investigation into INNOVATION CREDIT UNION and the actions of its agents including without limitation CHAD GARTNER.
- 25. The Appellant will also direct attention to paragraph 18 of the factum of CHERYL GIESBRECHT on behalf of the ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA which purported that "The Chambers judge was unable to find an unlawful deprivation of liberty in relation to the Appellant" which was a direct

denial of the right to test the validity of detention which is a constitutional and statutory violation, and thereby that the ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA acquiesced to the denial of the rights under sections 9 and 10 of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* (the "*Charter*"), Part I of the *Constitution Act, 1982*, being Schedule B to the *Canada Act 1982* (U.K.), 1982, chapter 11.

E. Court of Appeal Punishing the Impartial Appellant

- 26. The *Appellant* would like to direct attention to subsection 30(2) and 31(f) of the *The Legal Profession Act, 1990* with respect to both the *Application for Dispensing Service Without Notice* he had before JUSTICE J.A. SCHWANN in chambers of this Court on October 5 of last year and the "management meeting" he had before JUSTICE RALPH OTTENBREIT "in chambers" of this Court on February 9 of this year, namely:
 - **30(2)** Subject to section 31, a person, other than a member who holds a licence, who commences, prosecutes or defends an action or proceeding in a court of civil or criminal jurisdiction or acts as counsel or a lawyer in an action or proceeding is:
 - (a) incapable of recovering any fee, reward or disbursement on that account; and
 - **(b)** deemed to be guilty of a contempt of the court in which the proceeding has been commenced, carried on, defended or prosecuted, and may be proceeded against for contempt before the Court of Appeal or a judge of the court sitting in chambers.
 - 31 Section 30 does not apply to:
 - **(f)** a person who is a plaintiff or defendant in proceedings and who commences, <u>prosecutes or defends in the person's own name</u> an action or proceeding in a court of civil or criminal jurisdiction;
- 27. At no point during the coarse of the *Application for Dispensing Service Without Notice* or the "management meeting" was the *Appellant* "proceeded against for contempt before" JUSTICE J.A. SCHWANN or JUSTICE RALPH OTTENBREIT, former President of CANADIAN BAR ASSOCIATION (Saskatchewan Branch) and active in the KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS (a secret society), "in chambers" for commencing, prosecuting or defending "an action or proceeding in a court of civil or criminal jurisdiction or acts as counsel or a lawyer" which is *reasonable* and *rational* since the *Appellant* was and is applying in his own name, ROBERT A. CANNON, for a *Writ of Habeas Corpus* on behalf of the *Detainee* pursuant to subsection 3-64(2) of *The Queen's Bench Rules* which is as follows:
 - **3-64(2)** Any person is entitled to bring proceedings, on his or her own behalf or on behalf of any other person, to obtain an order of habeas corpus ad subjiciendum.

- The Appellant would like to direct attention to how JUSTICE RALPH OTTENBREIT purported that he had no authority to hear a motion for leave to appeal to the SUPREME COURT OF CANADA based on this Court's interpretation of the Supreme Court Act and that he had no authority to provide or recommend referral to the SUPREME COURT OF CANADA based on prejudice demonstrated in this Court. The motion and its appendices submitted on January 29 of this year for leave to appeal, which was discussed with JUSTICE RALPH OTTENBREIT, demonstrated the prejudice of this Court in that it must review the actions of JUSTICE J.A. SCHWANN and JUSTICE J.A. CALDWELL in making orders contrary to the UN Torture Convention which is an international instrument binding in CANADA and the Charter, thereby determining whether such are party to the foregoing conspiracy and should be imprisoned, this is the error of self-reporting; the same error previously made by JUSTICE N.D. CROOKS.
- 29. The *Appellant* would like to direct attention to how this Court sent him a justice that is affiliated with a secret society, the KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS, intending to punish him for pursuing leave to appeal and all prior litigation, especially after he purported that putting him in front of a person with FREEMASON leanings, which is a secret society, would demonstrate *prejudice*. The *Appellant* is a SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST, who follows the counsels of ELLEN G. WHITE which advocates against secret societies which is in compliance ethics for justices.
- 30. The foregoing, specifically paragraphs 9 to 18 and 26 to 29, demonstrates that both the SUPERIOR COURT and this Court have allowed the *Appellant* to represent himself and to change this practice on March 1 of this year would demonstrate that the sole purpose for proceeding against the *Appellant* for contempt would be in response to the fresh evidence within this application which implicates justices of this Court in suppressing an investigation into INNOVATION CREDIT UNION for the criminal involvement of many of its *rogue agents* in the mismanagement of the Covid emergency perpetuated by without limitation the SASKATCHEWAN HEALTH AUTHORITY and the ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE and the crimes herein; such would be an attempt to prevent the *Appellant* from prosecuting the matter and from being able to appeal to the SUPREME COURT OF CANADA which allows anyone to apply who has been permitted to represent in the lower courts.

F. Expectation of Further Punishment to the Impartial Appellant

31. The Appellant would like to direct attention to the suppression his rights to petition and free speech inside and outside of the court room in both CANADA and the UNITED STATES with respect to an investigation into INNOVATION CREDIT UNION for the criminal involvement of many of its rogue agents in the mismanagement of the Covid emergency which is being used to build a world without freedom through the dissolution of social order: Solve et Coagula as the MASONIC adage teaches.

- 32. The Appellant would like to direct attention to what happened to the last person who attempted to report and investigate INNOVATION CREDIT UNION for the criminal involvement of many of its rogue agents in the mismanagement of the Covid emergency; Dale on behalf of DSR KARIS was kidnapped and tortured by government officials including without limitation the SASKATCHEWAN HEALTH AUTHORITY and ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE to distract from and hinder an investigation into the same.
- 33. The *Appellant* would like to direct attention to the fact that he is the only impartial party not foreign to the situation and qualified to investigate this matter; the disappearance of the *Appellant* by the restriction of his physical liberty, however brief, would again delay an investigation into INNOVATION CREDIT UNION; it is reasonable to assume that the MASONIC conspirators are motivated to restrict the physical liberty of the *Appellant*.
- 34. The *Appellant* would like to direct attention to his second affidavit provided in this matter and affirmed on July 29 of last year which demonstrates his state of mind with respect to expectation of punishment when applying for *Writ of Habeas Corpus* which was seemingly justified by the actions of the justices of various courts over the coarse of the months to follow, namely:
 - I, Robert Cannon, in the City of Saskatoon, in the Province of Saskatchewan, swear that:
 - 1. I am a servant of our Lord Jesus Christ and the information set out in this affidavit is true because it is from Him.
 - 2. God by His Word has granted unto me knowledge of what is to come, that when it comes, you may believe that the LORD, he is the God, and that I am His servant.
 - 3. God has declared in the Holy Writ that the king of the South shall not escape out of the hand of the king of the North. I stand on this promise as God has commissioned me to challenge the world by His power. For I cry unto the LORD, that he will deliver His children from these principalities and powers that seek to torment His children and to mar the image of God.
 - 4. Those principalities and powers who control Saskatchewan seek to destroy God's children. God will force the hand of the North, for he shall come against the king of the South and enter into countries and shall overflow and pass over (see Exhibit D).
 - 5. If the LORD be God, follow him: but if Baal, then follow him. I, even I only, stand a prophet of the LORD; but Baals prophets are a multitude. Let God therefore pose a challenge to Baal, call on the name of your gods for to kill me, and I will call on the name of the LORD: and the God that answereth by destruction, let him be God. If I die, your gods be the

God; however if the those who have taken control of Saskatchewan during this Covid emergency are swarmed by the king of the North and overflowed and passed over, then the LORD, he is the God.

- 6. The king of the South will detain me for exposure to a person allegedly infected with Covid. I will be captured in front of the Court before being able to attend the hearing in which that very person's diagnosis of Covid is to be investigated and others by the Court (see Exhibit B). God shall force the ambassador of the king of the North, the United States, to enter into Saskatchewan and shall overflow and pass over (see Exhibit A and C).
- 7. God's Word is truth, act upon it, this is the third angels' message in verity.
- 35. The Appellant would like this Court to take notice, that he is not afraid of persecution as he fears GoD and not man, that he is not ashamed to call himself a Christian, nor is he ashamed to call himself AMERICAN, nor is he ashamed to call himself FREE.

III. CONCLUSION

- 36. The *Privilege of Writ of Habeas Corpus* is a CHRISTIAN right that guards the Life and Liberty of all people inside and outside of CANADA. Any person or persons who attempts to suspend or worse abolish this CHRISTIAN right are ANTI-CHRISTIAN and seek to abolish true CHRISTIANITY. The *Appellant* would like to direct attention the preamble the the *Charter*: "Whereas Canada is founded upon principles that recognize the supremacy of God and the rule of law".
- 37. This *Motion for Fresh Evidence* seeks to adduce fresh evidence which will impact an impartial decision by this Court, if impartiality were possible, namely:
 - (i) transcript of CHAD GARTNER on behalf of INNOVATION CREDIT UNION and DALE on behalf of DSR KARIS which is the exclusive property of DSR KARIS pursuant to clause 9 of the Non-Disclosure Agreement between INNOVATION CREDIT UNION and DSR KARIS, an agreement that INNOVATION CREDIT UNION breached and a major reason DALE and his daughters KAYSHA and the Detainee were kidnapped pursuant to fraudulent court orders and the reason subsequent requests for investigations were dismissed by the SUPERIOR COURT and suspended by this Court and courts abroad (see Appendix A on page 1a);
 - (ii) the Ex Parte Motion for Leave to Appeal to the Supreme Court for Writ of Habeas Corpus and its appendices submitted on January 29 of this year to this Court and the QUEEN'S PRIVY COUNSEL FOR CANADA given the prejudice of this Court and the resulting decision, such appendices include without limitation an Ex Parte & Pro Se Original Application for World Writ of Habeas Corpus in the INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL

- COURT, and evidence of the SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES arbitrarily suspending the *Privilege of Writ of Habeas Corpus* as part of a MASONIC conspiracy to cover up *criminal* and *terrorist* activity in both CANADA and the UNITED STATES (see Appendix D on page 57a);
- (iii) photo and transcript evidence of the arbitrary, unconstitutional, and unlawful detainment of CHRISTY which is the first independent party to be punished for DALE's actions (see Appendix B on page 17a); and
- (iv) the arbitrary suspension of the *Privilege of Writ of Habeas Corpus* by the UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA on the basis of falsehood purporting without limitation the unauthorized practice of law to *threaten*, *coerce*, and *punish* the *Appellant*, a seemingly common trend in both CANADA and the UNITED STATES with respect to the CHRISTIAN right of the *Privilege of Writ of Habeas Corpus* (see Appendix C on page 30a).
- 38. This motion is made pursuant to section 59 of the rules of this Court and requests waiving compliance with such rules for the foregoing where needed pursuant to subsection 4(1) of such rules given such motion is made to uphold the "supremacy of God and the rule of law".
- 39. The evidence specified in paragraph 2 and its subparagraphs above are all *relevant* to this appeal as it demonstrates a pattern of behaviour to cover up crime and suspend the justice thereof that transcends national boundaries which is demonstrated herein. This behaviour is to be expected of a transnational organization, the MASONS and their conspirators, which appears to have assumed control of a bank to *hide* and *fund* its criminal and terrorist activities both in CANADA and abroad. To disprove and alleviate this serious concern, only an investigation was to be requested; instead, DALE who was to request such investigation on behalf of DSR KARIS was kidnapped in front of the SUPERIOR COURT IN THE JUDICIAL CENTRE OF BATTLEFORD on July 23 of last year by the ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE and subsequently strapped to a bed a drugged against his will while the case was suspended *sine die* by a corrupt judge, JUSTICE R.W. ELSON. This evidence could not have, by due diligence, been adduced at trial as the evidence from subparagraph (ii) and (iv) did not exist at that time, the *Appellant* was not authorized to include subparagraph (ii), the evidence from subparagraph (iii) was omitted in error as pointed out by JUSTICE N.D. CROOKS and the ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA.

ALL OF WHICH is respectfully submitted,

Feburary 16, 2021

ROBERT A. CANNON 1102 Ave L North,

Saskatoon, SK CA S7L 2S1

Tel:

1 306 480-9473

Email:

robert.cannon@usask.ca

ROBERT A. CANNON

TO:

COURT OF APPEAL FOR SASKATCHEWAN

2425 Victoria Avenue

Regina, SK, S4P 4W6, Canada

AMY GROOTHIUS

Registrar

Tel: 1 306 787-5382

Email: CARegistrar@sasklawcourts.ca

AND TO:

CLERK OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL

Privy Council Office

85 Sparks Street, Room 1000 Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0A3

IAN SHUGART

Tel:

1 613 957-5153

1 613 957-5043

Email: info@pco-bcp.gc.ca

AND TO:

QUEEN'S PRIVY COUNCIL FOR CANADA

Forwarded by the Clerk of the Privy Council as complaints about justices and judges herein.

AND TO:

CARY RANSOME

198 1st Ave NE

Swift Current, SK, CA S9H 2B2

Email: Cary.Ransome@innovationcu.ca

AND TO: McDougall Gauley LLP

500-616 Main St

Saskatoon, SK, CA S7H 0J6

CHANTELLE C. EISNER (Barrister #4518)

Tel: 306-653-1212 Fax: 306-652-1323

Email: ceisner@mcdougallgauley.com

Lawyers for the Respondents Saskatchewan Health Authority, Rebecca Soy, Public Health Authority, Ken Startup, Battleford Union Hospital, and Saskatchewan Hospital

AND TO: ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA

Department of Justice Canada 410 22nd Street East, Suite 410 Saskatoon, SK S7K 5T6

CHERYL GIESBRECHT (Barrister #5883)

Tel: 1 306 518-0800 Fax: 1 306 975-4030

Email: Cheryl.Giesbrecht@Justice.gc.ca

Lawyers for the Respondents Constable Burton Roy and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police

AND TO: MATRIX LAW GROUP LLP

1421 101st St

North Battleford, SK, CA S9A 1A1

CLIFFORD A. HOLM (Barrister #3298)

Tel: 306-445-7300 Fax: 306-445-7302

Email: cholm@matrixlawgroup.ca

Lawyers for the Respondents Matrix Law Group, Patricia J. Meiklejohn, Cliff A. Holm, The Battlefords Seventh-Day Adventist Church, James Kwon, Gary Lund, Ciprian Bolah, Manitoba-Saskatchewan Conference, Michael Collins, and Kimberly Richardson

AND TO: CONSTABLE CARTIER

1052 101st St

North Battleford, SK, CA S9A 0Z3 Email: Brenda.Lucki@rcmp-grc.gc.ca

AND TO: Court of Queen's Bench for Saskatchewan

520 Spadina Cres E

Saskatoon, SK, CA S7K3G7 Email: qblrbattleford@gov.sk.ca

AND TO: McKercher LLP

374 3rd Avenue South Saskatoon SK S7K 1M5

DAVID M.A. STACK, Q.C. (Barrister #4086)

File: 124980.1 Tel: 1 306 653-2000 Fax: 1 306 653-2669 Email: d.stack@mckercher.ca

Lawyers for the Respondents The Honourable R.W. Elson

AND TO: MINISTRY OF JUSTICE AND ATTORNEY GENERAL

Government of Saskatchewan

1874 Scarth Street

Regina, Saskatchewan, S4P 4B3

Justin Stevenson (Barrister #5400)

Saskatchewan Justice Legal Division, Suite 900

Tel: 1 306 787-5224 Alt-Tel: 1 306 798-1419 Fax: 1 306 787-0581

Email: justin.stevenson@gov.sk.ca

Lawyers for the Respondents Glen Metiver, Honourable Judge M. Pelletier, and Kathleen Christopherson

LYNN CONNELLY, B.A., LL.B (Barrister #nil)

Crown Counsel Assistant

Constitutional Law Branch, Suite 800

Tel: 1 306 787-2527 Fax: 1 306 787-9111

Email: lynn.connelly@gov.sk.ca

Intervenor representative for the constitutional questions

AND TO: GRIFFIN TOEWS MADDIGAN

1530 Angus St

Regina, SK, CA S4T 1Z1

MICHAEL B. GRIFFIN (Barrister #3173)

Tel: 306-525-6125 Fax: 306-525-5226

Lawyers for the Respondents Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of Saskatchewan and Robert H. McDonald

AND TO: Provincial Court of Saskatchewan

3 Railway Ave E

North Battleford, SK, CA S9A 2P9

AND TO: REGINALD CAWOOD

PO Box 512

Cochin, SK, CA S0M 0L0

AND TO: Tonya Browarny

PO Box 39

North Battleford, SK, CA S9A 2X8

Email: executive@saskhealthauthority.ca

AND TO: OLIVE WALLER ZINKHAN & WALLER LLP

1000-2002 Victoria Ave Regina, SK, CA S4P 0R7

VIRGIL A. THOMSON (Barrister #4857)

Tel: 306-359-1888 Fax: 306-352-0771

Email: vthomson@owzw.com

Lawyers for the Respondents Virgil A. Thomson, Olive Waller Zinkhan & Waller LLP, Chantelle Thompson, Jennifer Schmidt, Mark Clements, Chad Gartner, Brad Appel, Ian McArthur, Bryce Bohun, Kathy Irwin, and Jason Panchyshyn.

APPENDICES

MOTION TO ADDUCE FRESH EVIDENCE FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

IN THE
COURT OF APPEAL FOR SASKATCHEWAN
CASE NO. CACV3708
FEBURARY 16, 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Append	dix A
	Transcript of Chad Gartner on behalf of Innovation Credit Union and Dale on behalf of DSR Karis which is the exclusive property of DSR Karis pursuant to clause 9 of the Non-Disclosure Agreement
Append	dix B
	Photo and transcript evidence of the arbitrary, unconstitutional, and unlawful detainment of Christy
Append	dix C
	Arbitrary suspension of the Privilege of Writ of Habeas Corpus by the United States District Court for the District of Nevada on the basis of falsehood and the unauthorized practice of law30a
Append	dix D
	Ex Parte Motion for Leave to Appeal to the Supreme Court for Writ of Habeas Corpus and its appendices submitted on January 29 of this year to this Court and the resulting decision57a

Appendix B

Photo and transcript evidence of the arbitrary, unconstitutional, and unlawful detainment of Christy

17a



Sexual Assault Crystal by RCMP August 12 2020

00:00 Crystal: I'm trying to reach out to Bobbie Cameron, head of the FSIN. He's an old—we used to play sports together.

00:09 Dale: Okay.

00:10 Crystal: I'm going to be reaching out to CTV, Prince Albert.

00:14 Dale: Okay.

00:15 Crystal: I can't---my cousin—for some reason she's not able to help so I'm not going to worry about

her.

00:19 Dale: Yeah.

00:20 Crystal: I'm looking into another woman, Johnstone Clarke Law Office, who's actually—she

originates from my children's ...unintelligible...

00:29 Dale: Okay.

00:30 Crystal: But I need your help from the outside.

00:31 Dale: Okay, what do you need?

00:33 Crystal: I—I don't know. I need to not be hel—I don't need to be in here 21days. I was healing at home and Kim triggered me and I walked away from him and I walked out of my yard. I walked to my gran—my father's graveside—sacred burial grounds and I sat with him for an hour. Kim said, okay come one, let's go. Soon as I got off that burial ground--my church is, a lone RCMP male, not a female--there was no female present, and I was in a dress and my breasts were hanging out—he was not—I've been abused. I've been abused again.

01:12 Dale: O my Lord.

01:14 Crystal: So I need you to—I know you're safe over there. I know your mamma is your protector and I was so happy to see that day that I came in--I was so happy to see that your mom was there and took you home, 'cause my mom, she can't fight for me. I have my other cousin, who's into multimedia, she's gonna try—I'm just pulling in everybody in on my life—I'm trying to help--I need help. They're trying to kill me in here. They're trying to give me a needle.

01:38 Dale: We-we'll help you. We will help you.

01:45 Crystal: You know where I am. ...unintelligible...

01:46 Dale: Yes—I--I need your last name and your age.

01:49 Crystal: Yeah. I'm going to give you both my aliases. My born name is Crystal—C R Y S T A L. Last name is Pam, P A M B R U N.

01:56 Dale: Yes, yes.

02:04 Crystal: And then of course I go by Crysty under health and still under my married name which would be Head—H E A D. So it'll either be Crystal Head or Crystal Pambrun or Crysty Head or Crysty Pambrun.

02:19 Dale: Okay is Chris still in there as well?

02:23 Crystal: Which Chris? No our Chris isn't. There's another new Kris with a K who was just pushed out. Joe Polako was kicked out, and he had no where to go.

02:31 Dale: Yeah I still talk to Joe though.

02:33 Crystal: Good, I—I'm happy because I still don't have a phone. People are trying keep me from being independent but we do have another sister here, Andrea Fineday, who's from Sweet Grass.

02:46 Dale: Yes.

02:46 Crystal: She was ready to hang herself today because she knows when they kick her out in three days, she's going to have to go back on the street and sell her body because if she goes back to her homelands in Sweet Grass, her family does the same thing. They rape her. They abuse her.

02:58 Dale: Oh my God-okay, we're going to do something.

03:03 Crystal: Thank you. Call me every day brother.

03:04 Dale: I will call you every day.

03:06 Crystal: Thank you. Call me tonight. I'm just like—I don't even know if I can even trust my partner because he's being swayed by the doctors and doesn't want—he just—I don't know. I don't know what's going on. I even reached out to my ex-husband, my children's father, like I'm desperate.

03:23 Dale: Alright, I will-I will help you.

03:26 Crystal: Thank you. So this is their phone number but you call me on that other line.

03:32 Dale: What's the other number?

03:34 Crystal: The patient one is 446-

03:37 Dale: Okay.

03:38 Crystal: 6--6544

03:40 Dale: Okay.

03:41 Crystal: That's the phone I always called you guys on.

03:44 Dale: I'll check on you tonight.

03:46 Crystal: Okay thank you my brother, I appreciate it. That way I can relax and eat some supper.

03:48 Dale: Alright, alright.

03:52 Crystal: Okay brother, stay strong and I hope you're healing. I know you're where you need to be and—I need your help.

04:00 Dale: Do you know the officer's name?

04:02 Crystal: Nope. I asked, I said what's your badge number? Are you on camera? Oh yep, yep. But my DNA's in that car. I spit in that car.

04:10 Dale: What is—can you describe him?

04:14 Crystal: He's mixed blood, colored eyes, fair skinned, probably--maybe my height, darker hair like a brownish but he has mixed colored eyes, fair skinned. It should be on record on the RCMP because they obviously have to keep records. System's changing my brother and I'm changing it from in here. I'm done with my Charley not getting—we have a nurse here, brings her own Ipad, and lets a nice little white girl use her Ipad, but Charley is not allowed to touch it 'cause it's hers. It's her personal one. Why does my autistic son in here not have the same access to technology because of his blood and because of his skin. I'm done with this—I'm not--I'm--so if you can't get ahold of me, as the guys can't find me, you know I'm strapped to a bed and you call me any indigenous lawyer, human rights lawyer, whoever it is. I have about \$4000 in my account for a retainer if I have to go broke.

05:24 Dale: We will do something for you.

05:26 Crystal: Thank you my brother.

05:28 Dale: I promise.

05:31 Crystal: K, can you say a little prayer for me please?

05:32 Dale: Yes I will. Heavenly Father, Lord, I ask you this day for your mercy. Lord you see the suffering, Lord, this young woman has gone through. Lord, it is unconscionable and I ask of you this day —I'm calling upon you for your aid. You've promised me that if you ask anything in your name you will do it, and you have given us a charge to help the weak, the suffering, the fatherless and the oppressed. And Oh Father I ask of you this day—Oh God, do not allow your name to be sullied. Lord help this woman who is crying out for your help and Father, I ask of you this day to give me the strength to help her is my prayer--

05:48 Crystal: Thank you. Yes. I pray that every meal. Thank you. I'm scared that tonight they're going to throw me, strap me to a bed and they're gonna find all my notes, all my information, I'm writing everything down.

06:23 Dale: Father, I ask of you this day to send your angels to protect her O Father this day, lead her and guide her in the way should go. O Father I ask you this day, Lord place your hands upon her and Lord give us the strength Lord to help her is my prayer in Jesus name, Amen.

06:23 Crystal: Thank you so much my brother, power of prayer, two or more, I know.

06:49 Dale: We will help you.

06:50 Crystal: Thank you. Please. And I'll look forward to your call tonight.

06:54 Dale: Alright.

06:55 Crystal: Okay thanks my brother, please keep keep take caring yourself and say hello to your mother and your daughter. I know that they're your strength and I just need, I don't have that strength here. I don't have that kind of support right now.

07:01 Dale: I will, yes.

07:12 Crystal: So I thank you again my brother. I better return this phone before they lock me up.

07:16 Dale: You will have help.

07:18 Crystal: Okay thank you so much.

07:20 Dale: You're welcome.

07:20 Crystal: Again say hi ...unintelligible... thank you so much. Okay, you're welcome thank you so much okay bye, I mean so long never say bye.

07:24 Dale: You're welcome. Alright—yes. I'll see you soon.

07:32 Crystal: Okay I'll see you soon, bye bye.

07:35 Dale: Bye.

Krystal Statement by Phone August 17 2020

00:00 Dale: I've got a question to ask you.

00:02 Crystal: Sure.

00:03 Dale: Are you still inside of the a-you're still inside the health center, right?

00:08 Crystal: Yeppers.

00:10 Dale: Okay, Do you mind if I use—do you wanna give me a statement that I can record and give to the a—put a part--'cause I'm gonna put it with my affadavit that I'm serving.

00:18 Crystal: Yes. Yeah.

00:26 Dale: Okay.

00:27 Crystal: But you're safe thought right?

00:28 Dale: Oh yes I'm safe.

00:29 Crystal: Okay, for sure.

00:32 Dale: 'Cause I'm going to court tomorrow.

00:25 Crystal: Okay, yeah for sure.

00:38 Dale: Okay do you wanna just a—tell me—tell me what happened with the member of the RCMP that you were talking about before so that I can have this on record?

00:48 Crystal: Uh the first time on July 20th I was—they were called to my home, a female and a male. A younger gentleman and woman who hand-cuffed me from behind and—on the ground in front of my child and gave me no sense of airflow or anything. I was strapped to a bed for two days, I believe. That's when I was given the needle. That was the first time. And then I was released on the 30th, I believe and came back on the following week, I think the 5th or the Thursday. And this time I was triggered by Kim and trying to get awa—walk away from him, so I was walking down the road by my great-grandmother's place and now it was a lone male police officer who wasn't even called. He just happened to be on that road and hand-cuffed me, same way, behind my back. Said he was hand-cuffing me so it wouldn't hurt but I had bruises on my wrists. And then again strapped to the bed with the needle and then put on those walking shackles to use the bathroom 'cause I refused to use bedpan and I still have um scars or scabs—sorry, scars or scabs on my ankles that haven't healed yet. I have no name, I have no—he said he was recording it but I don't have any information but I did um spit in both vehicles both times to leave my DNA.

02:38 Dale: Okay, I will tell you that I will include this as part of the complaint. And in my statement, I will be swearing in my affadavit that that RCMP officer will be brought to justice even if it cost me my life to do so.

02:53 Crystal: Yeah, yeah and I'm still here and I don't even know when I'm getting out. 'Cause I've been in here again already 11 days, altogether I've been in here 21, including that little break I had at home.

03:06 Dale: K, for the record, can you—would you be willing to give me authorization to speak to Kim in order to get the pictures that outlined your—the injuries that you sustained.

03:21 Crystal: Yeah, you sure can.

03:23 Dale: Okay.

03:24 Crystal: We got a funeral right now, doing a eulogy but um yeah you can contact him. I'll let him know. He's coming here after the funeral. They wouldn't even give me a day pass today to go to the funeral.

03:36 Dale: 'Cause I'm going to court tomorrow for the habeas corpus.

03:41 Crystal: Okay.

03:42 Dale: In part of my sta—in my statement um, I did mention you and I would like to include this a well

03:48 Crystal: Yeah, yeah, for sure.

03:52 Dale: Um as part of it because there's a few other things that were related that I would like to speak of and it's consistent with the types of treatment that is received—people receive at the SHA and the types of treatment that people receive--

04:05 Crystal: Yeah and I was pushed out probably 4 days too soon the first time, like literally was forced out was how Kim thought about it. He said—you weren't ready to come home and the doctor's just like—why are you still here? So, they by rights should have kept me for at least 4 or 5 more days and I was willing to at that time 'cause I knew I needed help but again, that's what happened—I went home, got triggered and ended up back in here again I think the 5th or the 6th up until today. And my appeal was denied this week, or no, when did I have my appeal? Latter part of last week I had an appeal and again it was denied.

04:48 Dale: Yes, did you get it through the Court of Queen's Bench?

04:52 Crystal: Just whatever one they have here.

04:56 Dale: Yeah and who is the person that represented you?

04:59 Crystal: Uh, would be-geez--it would be the Eldon Lindgren or Brent Illingworth.

05:08 Dale: Okay, those lawyers that rep—they--I--there's a conflict of interest. Since you have a connect--

05:14 Crystal: It is because--'cause they're the mental health lawyers. They're not outside lawyers.

05:20 Dale: But you're also--they work for Matrix Law Group.

05:24 Crystal: Oh okay.

05:25 Dale: Matrix Law Group um is one of the respondents in a case involving DSR Karis Consulting Incorporated, the corporation who I'm a representative of.

05:35 Crystal: Yeah, yeah, for sure.

05:38 Dale: Since as its Chief Executive Officer I was inside the Battlefords Mental Health Center and you had a connection to me, it was—um, it was wrong for them to put you with somebody with Matrix, given the circumstances.

05:54 Crystal: Yeah, and it was also wrong that the day after I leave that they brought the RCMP in to strap you down and give you the needle.

06:04 Dale: Oh yes. That--

06:05 Crystal: That was planned I think 'cause they know that I'm a voice...unintelligible... so.

06:10 Dale: Don't—don't worry, I'm—you're going to be heard.

06:14 Crystal: Thank you so much.

06:15 Dale: And you will be heard and this audio will also be part of it so they can hear your voice and hear your story of what's been said because it's about time that those people be brought to justice.

06:29 Crystal: Thank you so much.

06:31 Dale: Oh you're welcome—just thank God because--

06:33 Crystal: I probably should keep this short because you know--

06:36 Dale: Yes let me have a prayer with you before you go.

06:39 Crystal: For sure, please.

06:41 Dale: Heavenly Father, Lord I thank you this day. Watch over Cryste as she's inside the mental health center and Lord you see the problems that she's having here. I ask of you this day to intervene on her behalf. Lord send your Spirit of Truth upon her to guide her in all truth. And Lord give her the justice that she deserves—the justice that she needs. Lord you see the evil-doers are continually trying to oppress her because she wants to speak up for what is right. But oh Father I ask of you this day to send your angels who excel in strength to encamp around her and keep the forces of the enemy at bay and strengthen her as she continues to go on each day. And Lord I ask of you this day to bless this court case

that she can get the help that she needs. I thank you and praise You this day for hearing and answering my prayer. In Jesus precious Name, Amen.

07:27 Crystal: Amen, thank you so much.

07:30 Dale: God's gonna win the day—we'll get you some help.

07:34 Crystal: Thank you so much. You take care and God bless your mother and your daughter and your wife, okay?

07:40 Dale: Alright, thank you and God bless.

07:41 Crystal: And your little one.

07:43 Dale: Thank you very much and God bless your family.

07:44 Crystal: Okay, yeah thank you so much Dale—so good to talk to you.

07:48 Dale: Alright.

07:49 Crystal: Okay we'll talk again soon.

07:50 Dale: K, Bye.

07:51 Crystal: Okay, bye, bye.

Appendix C

Arbitrary suspension of the Privilege of Writ of Habeas Corpus by the United States District Court for the District of Nevada on the basis of falsehood and the unauthorized practice of law

AO450 (NVD Rev. 2/18) Judgment in a Civil Case

	Un	NITED STATES DIS	STRICT COURT	
		DISTRICT OF N	NEVADA	
KAYSH	A DERY RICHARDS		MENT IN A CIVIL CASE	
	Petitio	oner,	Number: 2:20-cv-02218-JAD-DJA	
ATTOR STATES	NEY GENERAL of th		vuilloet. 2.20-cv-02210-JAD-DJA	
	Respo	ondents.		
	ury Verdict. This act		or a trial by jury. The issues have been tried and	
	Decision by Court. The r heard and a decision		aring before the Court. The issues have been tried	
	Decision by Court. This action came for consideration before the Court. The issues have been considered and a decision has been rendered.			
			nd against Petitioner dismissing this case without	
J	January 27, 2021		DEDDA V VEMDI	
_	Date			
		TOURT FOR	/s/ H. Magennis	



1/29/2021

CM/ECF - nvd - District Version 6.3.3

CLOSED, HABEAS

United States District Court District of Nevada (Las Vegas) CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 2:20-cv-02218-JAD-DJA

Richardson v. Attorney General of the United States et al

Assigned to: Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey

Referred to: Magistrate Judge Daniel J. Albregts

Cause: 28:2241 Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (federa

Date Filed: 12/08/2020 Date Terminated: 01/27/2021 Jury Demand: None

Nature of Suit: 463 Habeas Corpus - Alien

Detainee

Jurisdiction: U.S. Government Defendant

Petitioner

Kaysha Dery Richardson

represented by Kaysha Dery Richardson

Nevada Southern Detention Center 2190 East Mesquite Ave

Pahrump, NV 89060 PRO SE

V.

Respondent

Attorney General of the United States

Respondent

U/S/ Department of Homeland Security

Respondent

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration

Services

Respondent

U.S. Immigration and Customs

Enforcement

Respondent

Scott Robinson

ZCR 193

Respondent

Nevada Southern Detention Center

Respondent

Warden Brian Koehn

Date Filed	#	Docket Text
12/08/2020		Case randomly assigned to Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey and Magistrate Judge Daniel J.

https://ecf.nvd.uscourts.gov/cgi-bin/DktRpt.pl?805941238811355-L 1 0-1

1/2

29/2021		CM/ECF - nvd - District Version 6.3.3		
		Albregts. (RT) (Entered: 12/08/2020)		
12/08/2020 1 PETITION for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Vol. 1) (Filing fee \$ 5) by Kaysha Dery F (Attachments: # 1 Affidavit of Robert Cannon, # 2 Exhibit Vol. 2, # 3 Exhibit Vol. Exhibit Vol. 4, # 5 Exhibit Vol. 5, # 6 Exhibit Vol. 6, # 7 Exhibit Vol. 7, # 8 Rece #NVLAS073107) (HAM) (Entered: 12/08/2020)				
12/08/2020	2	NOTICE from USDC advising case against Attorney General of the United States, et al., has been received and assigned case number 2:20-cv-02218-JAD-DJA . (HAM) (Entered: 12/08/2020)		
01/27/2021	3	ORDER DISMISSING CASE. IT IS ORDERED that Petitioner Kaysha Dery Richardson's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus $\underline{1}$ is DISMISSED without prejudice. A certificate of appealability is DENIED.		
		Robert Cannon is prohibited from submitting any future documents on Richardson's behalf, and Richardson must sign and submit any future documents personally.		
		IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of Court is instructed to: MAIL a copy of this order to: 1. Kaysha Dery Richardson, Nevada Southern Detention Center, 2190 East Mesquite Avenue Pahrump, Nevada 89060; and Robert Cannon, 1102 Ave. L North, Saskatoon, Canada S7L 2S1; and 2. UPDATE the docket to reflect the Nevada Southern Detention Center as Richardson's current address. 3. ENTER FINAL JUDGMENT dismissing this action, and CLOSE THIS CASE.		
		Signed by Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey on 1/27/2021. (Copies have been distributed pursuant to the NEF - HAM) (Entered: 01/27/2021)		
01/27/2021	4	JUDGMENT in favor of Attorney General of the United States, Nevada Southern Detention Center, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, U/S/ Department of Homeland Security, Brian Koehn, Scott Robinson agains Kaysha Dery Richardson. Signed by Clerk of Court Debra K. Kempi on 1/27/2021. (Copies have been distributed pursuant to the NEF - HAM) (Entered: 01/27/2021)		

PACER Service Center								
Transaction Receipt								
	01/29/20	021 13:16:13						
PACER Login:	ljlitman:2779600:0	Client Code:						
Description:	Docket Report	Search Criteria:	2:20-cv-02218-JAD- DJA					
Billable Pages:	2	Cost:	0.20					
Exempt flag:	Not Exempt	Exempt reason:	Not Exempt					

PACER fee: Not Exempt Change

Case 2:20-cv-02218-JAD-DJA Document 3 Filed 01/27/21 Page 1 of 6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA 3 4 KAYSHA DERY RICHARDSON, Case No. 2:20-cv-02218-JAD-DJA 5 Petitioner **Order Dismissing Habeas Petition** 6 v. [ECF No. 1] 7 ATTORNEY GENERAL of the UNITED STATES, et al., 8 Respondents 9 10 Immigration detainee Kaysha Dery Richardson petitions for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241, 1 seeking review of her immigration proceedings. On initial review 11 12 under the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, ² I find that her petition is plagued by 13 jurisdictional defects, so I dismiss the petition without prejudice. 14 Background³ 15 Richardson is a citizen of Canada with Métis indigenous heritage.⁴ She filed the petition 16 on December 8, 2020, to challenge her continued detention at the Nevada Southern Detention 17 Center in Pahrump, Nevada.⁵ Upon entry to the United States, on October 1, 2020, she was 18 detained by the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement division of the Department of 19 Homeland Security ("DHS"). Richardson then filed an application for asylum or withholding 20 from removal based on her race, religion, and political position. An asylum officer interviewed 21 her and determined that she did not establish a credible fear of persecution. 6 The petition alleges 22 ¹ ECF No. 1. Petitioner paid the \$5.00 filing fee when filing the petition. ECF No. 1-8. 23 ² All references to a "Habeas Rule" or the "Habeas Rules" in this order identify the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts. 24 ³ This procedural history is derived from Richardson's allegations and exhibits. 25 ⁴ The Canadian government recognizes the Métis as a distinct indigenous people. See First Nations People, Métis and Inuit in Canada: Diverse and Growing Populations, Statistics Canada (Mar. 20, 2018), 26 https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/89-659-x/89-659-x2018001-eng.htm. ⁵ Richardson did not sign the petition herself. Instead, it was signed and submitted by "her advocate 'any 27 person' Robert Cannon." See ECF No. 1 at 10.

28

6 Id. at 93-97.

Case 2:20-cv-02218-JAD-DJA Document 3 Filed 01/27/21 Page 2 of 6

that the asylum officer refused to consider evidence she provided and failed to examine all relevant considerations. She appealed the negative finding of credible fear to an immigration judge ("IJ"), but no decision was issued by the time her petition was filed.⁷

Richardson alleges that the petition arises under the United States Constitution, the Immigration and Nationality Act ("INA"),⁸ the United Nations Convention Against Torture, and the United Nations Refugee Convention. She claims that her detention is arbitrary, unlawful, and violates the Fourth, Fifth, and Eighth Amendments. In the prayer for relief, Richardson asks the court to assume jurisdiction over this matter, order respondents to release her on her own recognizance, and grant any other relief deemed proper for both her and "her advocate 'any person' Robert Cannon."⁹

I take judicial notice of the status of the proceedings in Richardson's immigration case before the Las Vegas Immigration Court. On December 17, 2020, the IJ affirmed DHS's decision regarding asylum or withholding from removal. Richardson has yet to appeal that decision to the Board of Immigration Appeals ("BIA") or file a petition for review in the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, 11 and no future hearings are currently scheduled.

Discussion

As an initial matter, I find that the petition was improperly submitted by Robert Cannon as Richardson's "advocate 'any person." Pro se parties may not pursue claims on behalf of

⁷ ECF No. 1 at 4 ("It has been forty-three (43) days since the credible fear of persecution interview and the Petitioner has had no review of determination by an immigration judge and no guarantee that she ever will.").

^{8 8} U.S.C. § 1101 et seq.

^{23 9} ECF No. 1 at 10.

¹⁰ See, e.g., Dent v. Holder, 627 F.3d 365, 371 (9th Cir. 2010) (courts may take "judicial notice of the agency's own records") (citing *Lising v. I.N.S.*, 124 F.3d 996, 999 (9th Cir. 1997)). Automated case information may be accessed online at https://portal.eoir.justice.gov/InfoSystem/Form?Language=EN.

¹¹ I also take judicial notice of the Ninth Circuit's online docket records. See Harris v. County of Orange, 682 F.3d 1126, 1131–32 (9th Cir. 2012). The Ninth Circuit's docket records may be accessed at www.pacer.gov. As explained in this order, the Ninth Circuit has exclusive jurisdiction over any petition for review arising from the Las Vegas Immigration Court.

¹² ECF No. 1 at 10.

Case 2:20-cv-02218-JAD-DJA Document 3 Filed 01/27/21 Page 3 of 6

others in a representative capacity. ¹³ Only a licensed attorney—an active member of the State Bar of Nevada admitted to practice under the Nevada Supreme Court Rules— is authorized to represent a client in Nevada. ¹⁴ In federal courts, "the parties may plead and conduct their own cases *personally or by counsel.*" ¹⁵ No rule or statute permits a non-attorney to represent any other person, a company, a trust, or any other entity. ¹⁶ Cannon will not be permitted to engage in the unauthorized practice of law by purporting to represent or act on behalf of Richardson. Moving forward, Cannon is prohibited from submitting documents on Richardson's behalf, and Richardson must plead and conduct her own case personally.

Turning to initial review, Habeas Rule 4 requires the assigned judge to examine a habeas petition and order a response unless it "plainly appears" that the petitioner is not entitled to relief.¹⁷ This rule allows courts to screen and dismiss petitions that are patently frivolous, vague, conclusory, palpably incredible, false, ¹⁸ or plagued by procedural defects. ¹⁹ Federal district courts may grant a writ of habeas corpus when a person is "in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States."

But Congress has restricted judicial review of immigration matters. ²¹ To accomplish "streamlined judicial review," the REAL ID Act of 2005²² eliminated the district courts' "habeas

19

22

23

25

26

27

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

3

¹⁷ 18

¹³ See, e.g., Simon v. Hartford Life, Inc., 546 F.3d 661, 665 (9th Cir. 2008) (collecting cases); Russell v. United States, 308 F.2d 78, 79 (9th Cir. 1962) ("A litigant appearing in propria persona has no authority to represent anyone other than himself.").

^{20 | &}lt;sup>14</sup> Guerin v. Guerin, 993 P.2d 1256, 1258 (Nev. 2000) (citing NRS 7.285); Martinez v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct., 729 P.2d 487, 488 (Nev. 1986) (an individual "has no right to be represented by an agent other than counsel in a court of law").

¹⁵ 28 U.S.C. § 1654 (emphasis added).

¹⁶ Jackson v. United Artists Theatre Circuit, Inc., 278 F.R.D. 586, 596 (D. Nev. 2011).

¹⁷ See Valdez v. Montgomery, 918 F.3d 687, 693 (9th Cir. 2019).

²⁴ Hendricks v. Vasquez, 908 F.2d 490, 491 (9th Cir. 1990) (collecting cases).

¹⁹ See Boyd v. Thompson, 147 F.3d 1124, 1128 (9th Cir. 1998).

²⁰ 28 U.S.C. § 2241(c)(3).

²¹ Alvarez-Barajas v. Gonzales, 418 F.3d 1050, 1052 (9th Cir. 2005); see also 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(5) (notwithstanding § 2241 or any other habeas provision, "a petition for review filed with an appropriate court of appeals ... shall be the sole and exclusive means for judicial review of an order of removal").

²² Pub. L. No. 109-13 Div. B, 119 Stat. 231.

Case 2:20-cv-02218-JAD-DJA Document 3 Filed 01/27/21 Page 4 of 6

jurisdiction, including jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241, over final orders of deportation, exclusion, or removal" and made "the circuit courts the 'sole' judicial body able to review challenges to final orders of deportation, exclusion, or removal." In addition, matters involving the Attorney General's "discretionary judgment" are generally precluded from judicial review. Dismissal of a § 2241 petition is appropriate where the petition challenges orders of deportation, exclusion, or removal. 25

District courts retain narrow habeas jurisdiction to review "bond hearing determinations for constitutional claims and legal error" following administrative exhaustion. ²⁶ The Ninth Circuit has outlined the proper procedure for challenging immigration bond determinations. ²⁷ Once a non-citizen has received a bond hearing before an IJ, she may appeal the IJ's decision to the BIA. ²⁸ If the non-citizen "is dissatisfied with the BIA's decision, [s]he may then file a habeas petition in the district court, challenging continued detention." ²⁹ The district court's decision on the habeas petition may be appealed to the Ninth Circuit. ³⁰ In a case by non-citizen who does not follow this course and thus fails to exhaust administrative remedies before pursuing habeas relief, "a district court should ordinarily dismiss the petition without prejudice or stay the proceedings until the petitioner has exhausted administrative remedies, unless

17 18

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

19

20

2122

23

27

²³ Alvarez-Barajas, 418 F.3d at 1052.

²⁴ See 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g). The INA explicitly exempts asylum determinations from the jurisdictional bar over discretionary decisions, but judicial review occurs in the courts of appeal—not in the district court

on a § 2241 habeas petition. Morales v. Gonzales, 478 F.3d 972, 979 (9th Cir. 2007) (citing 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(B)(ii)), abrogated on other grounds as stated by Anaya-Ortiz v. Holder, 594 F.3d 673, 678

(9th Cir. 2010).

4

²⁵ Puri v. Gonzales, 464 F.3d 1038, 1041 (9th Cir. 2006).

^{24 26} Singh v. Holder, 638 F.3d 1196, 1200 (9th Cir. 2011) (citing Demore v. Kim, 538 U.S. 510, 516–17 (2003)).

 ^{25 | 27} Leonardo v. Crawford, 646 F.3d 1157, 1159 (9th Cir. 2011) (citing Casas-Castrillon v. Dep't of Homeland Security, 535 F.3d 942 (9th Cir. 2008)).

²⁸ Id

²⁹ Id.

³⁰ *Id*.

exhaustion is excused."³¹ This exhaustion requirement is subject to waiver in certain instances³² but is "ordinarily not optional."³³

Richardson's petition does not clearly allege whether she seeks to challenge a removal order, denial of asylum and withholding from removal, indefinite detention, or a bond determination. However, jurisdiction is not proper for any such challenge. The Ninth Circuit is the sole judicial body with jurisdiction to entertain a petition for review addressing removal, withholding of removal, or asylum. Although this court has jurisdiction to the extent Richardson seeks review of a bond determination, the petition does not allege or demonstrate administrative exhaustion, *i.e.*, that Richardson moved for bond in the Las Vegas Immigration Court, an IJ issued a decision, Richardson appealed the IJ's decision to the BIA, and the BIA issued a decision. Instead, the petition and exhibits indicate that Richardson sought review of the asylum officer's negative credible-fear determination. This was insufficient to exhaust any detention or bond claims. Richardson may not pursue habeas relief regarding detention or bond until both an IJ and the BIA have considered her claims. The petition does not seek waiver of exhaustion, nor does the record demonstrate that waiver is appropriate. Accordingly, I dismiss the petition without prejudice.

Conclusion

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

- Petitioner Kaysha Dery Richardson's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus [ECF No. 1] is DISMISSED without prejudice.
- 2. A certificate of appealability is DENIED, as jurists of reason would not find dismissal

³¹ *Id.* at 1160 (noting that a § 2241 petition may be properly pursued "[o]nce the BIA render[s] its decision"); *Laing v. Ashcroft*, 370 F.3d 994, 1000 (9th Cir. 2004) (habeas jurisdiction under "§ 2241 is ordinarily reserved for instances in which no other judicial remedy is available") (citation omitted). ³² *Hernandez v. Sessions*, 872 F.3d 976, 988–89 (9th Cir. 2017).

³³ Castro-Cortez v. INS, 239 F.3d 1037, 1047 (9th Cir. 2001).

³⁴ See generally ECF No. 1.

³⁵ See Leonardo, 646 F.3d at 1160 (citing Rojas-Garcia v. Ashcroft, 339 F.3d 814, 819 (9th Cir. 2003) (a petitioner "must exhaust administrative remedies before raising . . . constitutional claims in a habeas petition when those claims are reviewable by the BIA on appeal")).

	Case 2:20-cv-02218-JAD-DJA Document 3 Filed 01/27/21 Page 6 of 6		
1	of the petition to be debatable or wrong.		
2	3. Robert Cannon is prohibited from submitting any future documents on Richardson's		
3	behalf, and Richardson must sign and submit any future documents personally.		
4	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of Court is instructed to:		
5	MAIL a copy of this order to:		
6	a. Kaysha Dery Richardson Nevada Southern Detention Center		
7	2190 East Mesquite Avenue		
8	Pahrump, Nevada 89060		
9	b. Robert Cannon 1102 Ave. L North		
10	Saskatoon, Canada S7L 2S1		
11	2. UPDATE the docket to reflect the Nevada Southern Detention Center as Richardson's		
12	current address.		
13	3. ENTER FINAL JUDGMENT dismissing this action, and CLOSE THIS CASE.		
14	Dated: January 27, 2021		
15	2084		
16	U.S. District Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey		
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

CASE NO.	
----------	--

BETWEEN:

Kaysha Dery/Richardson, a Canadian and Métis citizen with no criminal record in any country located at 1292 95th Street, North Battleford, SK S9A 0G2 with ancestral homeland in the Provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta in the Country of Canada and the State of Montana in the Country of the United States.

(hereinafter the "Petitioner")

- and -

- 1. Attorney General of the United States;
- 2. U.S. Department of Homeland Security;
- 3. U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services;
- 4. U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement;
- 5. Scott Robinson, ZCH 193;
- 6. Nevada Southern Detention Center; and
- 7. Brian Koehn.

(hereinafter each a "Respondent", collectively, the "Respondents")

EX PARTE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

VOLUME I OF VII

November 27, 2020

ROBERT CANNON

1102 Ave L North, Saskatoon, SK CA S7L 2S1

Tel: 306 480-9473

Email: robert.cannon@usask.ca

"ANY PERSON" FOR THE PETITIONER

- 2 -

TO: ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

U.S. Department of Justice, National Security Division 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20530

Tel: 202 514-2007 Email: nsd.public@usdoj.gov

Fax: 202 514-5331

AND TO: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

245 Murray Lane, SW, Washington, DC 20528-0075

Tel: 202 282-8000

AND TO: U.S. CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES

111 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, MS 2260, Washington, DC 20529-2260

AND TO: U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

500 12th Street, SW, Washington, DC 20024

AND TO: SCOTT ROBINSON, ZCH 193

Asylum Officer, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement

500 12th Street, SW, Washington, DC 20024

AND TO: NEVADA SOUTHERN DETENTION CENTER

2190 East Mesquite Avenue, Pahrump, NV 89060
Tel: 775-751-4500 Fax: 775-751-8763

AND TO: BRIAN KOEHN

Warden, Nevada Southern Detention Center 2190 East Mesquite Avenue, Pahrump, NV 89060 Tel: 775-751-4500 Fax: 775-751-8763

- 3 -

EX PARTE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

This is an ex parte petition for a writ of habeas corpus filed on behalf of the Petitioner seeking release from her arbitrary, unlawful, and unconstitutional detainment which is in violation of international instruments binding in the United States and protection from being detained again in like manner. The Respondents have detained and tortured the Petitioner since October 1, 2020 when the Petitioner attempted to enter as a proven Métis citizen (see page 7 for the Métis card and identification and page 162 for A Métis Plea for Safety) and subsequently filed a 1214-page asylum application with over 5 gigabytes of media and video footage (see page 295 for the asylum application) which demonstrated that she, a card holding Métis citizen in Saskatchewan (see page 5 for the reissued Métis card), was seeking remedy on behalf of a corporation in the local superior court and was abducted, detained, and tortured by the court Deputy Sheriff, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police which is the national police force, and the Saskatchewan Health Authority (see page 430 for the kidnapping gallery and watch "Video of Dale Richardson and Kaysha Dery Arrested In Front of the Court House.mp4" in "Affidavit of Robert Cannon July 27th Exhibits" on the USB flash drive). The Petitioner sought asylum or withholding of removal based on race, religion, political position with respect to the mismanagement of the Covid emergency (see page 1319 for transnational terrorist financing report and page 1339 for the engineering technical report), and the United Nations Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (hereinafter the "U.N. Torture Convention") which is binding in the United States.

The asylum officer, Scott Robinson (ZCH 193), which conducted the *Petitioner*'s credible fear of persecution interview and made his decision (see page 77 for the Record of Determination for the asylum interview) on October 15, 2020 under section 235(b)(1)(B)(iii)(I) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, he alleged that she was credible (see page 82 for the Record of Determination for the asylum interview), but did not believe that she had credible fear of being persecuted by her centrally governed international church, the courts, or the national police force again in Canada despite her having filed for asylum from them, that her infant sister is still detained by their authority (see page 17 for the Kidnapping of the Petitioner's infant sister Karis Richardson, page 365 Justice R.W. Elson orders, and page 712 for the habeas corpus appeal books), and evidence that those of Métis descent are persecuted in Canada (see page 115 for the National Inquiry Into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls); the asylum officer is not a competent authority and did not take into account all relevant considerations as he intentionally did not consider the evidence provided in the 1214-page asylum application with over 5 gigabytes of media and video footage. This policy and practice is a direct violation of Article 3 of the U.N. Torture Convention. The Petitioner immediately appealed the decision under section 235(b)(1)(B)(iii)(III) of the Immigration and Nationality Act which guarantees her a prompt review of determination by an immigration judge within seven (7) days. It has been fortythree (43) days since the credible fear of persecution interview and the Petitioner has had no review of determination by an immigration judge and no guarantee that she ever will.

The moment the *Petitioner*, which has no criminal record, was taken into custody at the border for claiming asylum, her amendment IV: security of person, amendment V: nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law, and amendment VIII: no cruel and unusual punishments inflicted rights guaranteed under the United States Constitution (hereinafter the "U.S. Constitution") were violated making her detainment arbitrary, unlawful, and unconstitutional. The moment officials of the United States at the border began threatening the Petitioner with being taken into custody for applying for asylum and attempting to coerce her into returning to Canada without filing asylum, such

officials began torturing her under Article 1 of the U.N. Torture Convention as they were punishing her for providing evidence that the Canadian government tortured her. The continued physical and psychological maltreatment of the Petitioner throughout her arbitrary, unlawful, and unconstitutional detainment (see USB flash drive the audio recordings of the Petitioner while in Nevada Southern Detention Center) which is in violation of international instruments binding in the United States constitutes torture under Article 1 of the U.N. Torture Convention and is in violation of article 3 and 4 of the United Nations Convention relating to the Status of Refugees (hereinafter the "U.N. Refugee Convention") with respect to non-discrimination and religious rights. The moment that the asylum officer, Scott Robinson, ZCH 193, affixed his signature to the Record of Determination for the credible fear interview, the Petitioner's arbitrary, unlawful, and unconstitutional detainment was in violation of Article 3 of the U.N. Torture Convention as the asylum officer is not a competent authority and did not take into account all relevant considerations. The moment the clock struck twelve on October 23, 2020 seven (7) days after the credible fear interview, the Petitioner's arbitrary, unlawful, and unconstitutional detainment which is in violation of international instruments binding in the United States was definitely no longer justifiable under the Immigration and Nationality Act or any other act.

The *Petitioner* is a passport holding Canadian citizen and card holding Métis citizen in Saskatchewan with no criminal record in any countries and such citizenship documentation was provided to the *officials* at the border; the *Petitioner* has travelled to the United States many times, given the US-Canada borders' relaxed legislation with respect to cross border travel between Canada and the United States and she is *not a flight risk* or *a risk to the community*. The *Petitioner* has demonstrated that she is a professional with ongoing obligations both in Canada and the United States (see page 1274 for the affidavit of extraordinary condition), these obligations make the *Petitioner* easy to locate. The *Petitioner*, being Métis, has ancestral homeland in both Saskatchewan and Alberta in Canada and Montana in the United States.

CUSTODY

1. The Petitioner is in the physical custody of the Respondents Attorney General of the United States, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Scott Robinson, ZCH 193 or his supposed successor Collazo, Nevada Southern Detention Center, Brian Koehn in Pahrump, Nevada. At the time of the filing of this petition, the Petitioner is detained at the Nevada Southern Detention Center in Pahrump, Nevada. The Nevada Southern Detention Center contracts with the U.S. Department of Homeland Security to detain aliens such as the Petitioner. The Petitioner is under the direct control of the Respondents and their agents.

JURISDICTION

2. This action arises under the *U.S. Constitution*, the *U.N. Torture Convention*, the *U.N. Refugee Convention*, and the *Immigration and Nationality Act*. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. 2241, article I, § 9, clause 2 of the *U.S. Constitution* and 28 U.S.C. § 1331, as the *Petitioner* is presently in custody under color of authority of the United States and such custody is in violation of the *Constitution*, *laws*, *or treaties of the United States*. This Court may grant relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241, and the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651; however, this petition shall not be construed as a means to acquire monetary relief, and the *Petitioner*

reserves the right to seek relief for her *arbitrary*, *unlawful*, and *unconstitutional* detainment which is in violation of *international instruments* binding in the United States.

VENUE

3. Venue lies in the United States District Court for the District of Nevada, the judicial district in which the *Respondents* Nevada Southern Detention Center and the Brian Koehn reside and where the *Petitioner* is detained pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e).

PARTIES

- 4. The Petitioner Kaysha Dery/Richardson is a national and citizen of Canada and a citizen of the Métis federation of Saskatchewan who was taken into custody when seeking refugee on October 1, 2020 at the Sweetgrass Port of Entry in Montana: (1) on the basis of being Métis with ancestral homeland in Montana under United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (U.N. Rights of Indigenous Peoples) which is not legally binding and upon refusal, (2) subsequently by applying for asylum with credible fear of persecution from the Seventh-Day Adventist Church which is the centrally governed international church she attends, the courts, and the national police force. She was detained by the Respondents pursuant to 235(b)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act prior to October 23, 2020; however, since the Respondents failed to provide a review of determination by an immigration judge by October 23, 2020, she is being held pursuant to no law, her detainment is entirely arbitrary, unlawful, and unconstitutional and is in violation of international instruments binding in the United States.
- 5. The Respondent Scott Robinson, ZCH 193 is an asylum officer under the authority of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, which is under the authority of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, which is under the authority of U.S. Department of Homeland Security, which is under the authority of the Attorney General of the United States. Respondents Scott Robinson, ZCH 193 or his supposed successor Collazo is a custodial official acting within the boundaries of the judicial district of the United States Court for the District of Nevada. Pursuant to the Respondents Scott Robinson, ZCH 193's orders, the Petitioner remains detained.
- The Respondent Brian Koehn is the warden of the Nevada Southern Detention Center in Pahrump, Nevada. He is the Petitioner's immediate custodian and resides in the judicial district of the United States Court for the District of Nevada.

EXHAUSTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES

- 7. The Petitioner has exhausted her administrative remedies to the extent required by law.
- 8. She has fully cooperated with the Respondents in asylum application and appeal process and has not delayed or obstructed the same save complaints about being maltreated with respect to her health resulting in allergic reactions and infringement of religious freedom with respect to diet.

9. The *Petitioner*'s only remedy is by way of this judicial action as the *Respondents* have been *uncooperative*.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

- 10. The Petitioner is a national and citizen of Canada and a citizen of the Métis federation of Saskatchewan who was taken into custody when seeking refugee on October 1, 2020 at the Sweetgrass Port of Entry in Montana:
 - (1) on the basis of being Métis with ancestral homeland in Montana under *U.N. Rights of Indigenous Peoples* which is not legally binding and upon refusal,
 - (2) subsequently by applying for asylum with *credible fear of persecution* from the Seventh-Day Adventist Church which is the *centrally governed church* she attends, the Saskatchewan *courts*, and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police which is the *national police force*
- 11. The *officials* of the United States at the border *threatened* the *Petitioner* with being taken into custody for applying for asylum and attempted to *coerce* her into returning to Canada without filing asylum. The *Petitioner* was denied her vegan diet throughout her *arbitrary*, *unlawful*, and *unconstitutional* detainment which is in violation of *international instruments* binding in the United States; the food she was provided by the Nevada Southern Detention Center caused her allergic reactions and violated her religious beliefs. The *Petitioner* is a Seventh-Day Adventist which should be eating vegan at this time in earth's history in accordance with the *Spirit of Prophecy* which advocates healthy eating; the prison Chaplin was uncooperative and denied her beliefs demonstrating that he believed that he understood her religion's health message better than her. This is *torture*.
- 12. The asylum officer, Scott Robinson, ZCH 193, conducted the *Petitioner*'s *credible fear of persecution* interview and made his decision on October 15, 2020 under section 235(b)(1)(B) (iii)(I) of the *Immigration and Nationality Act*. He alleged that she was credible, but did not believe that she had credible fear of being persecuted by her *centrally governed church*, the Saskatchewan *courts*, or the *national police force* again in Canada despite her having filed for asylum from them, that her infant sister is still detained by their authority, and evidence that those of Métis descent are persecuted in Canada. The *Petitioner* immediately appealed the decision under section 235(b)(1)(B)(iii)(III) of the *Immigration and Nationality Act* which *guarantees* her a prompt review of determination by an immigration judge within seven (7) days.
- 13. It has been forty-three (43) days since the credible fear of persecution interview and the *Petitioner* has had no review of determination by an immigration judge and no guarantee that she ever will.
- 14. The *Respondents*' decision to detain the *Petitioner* is a crime and arbitrary. There is no better time for the Court to consider the merits of the *Petitioner*'s request for release.

-7-

AFFIDAVIT AND OTHER EVIDENCE TO BE USED IN SUPPORT OF THIS APPLICATION

- 15. Affidavit of "Any Person" Robert Cannon
- 16. Reissued Métis Card
- 17. Identification Provided to the United States
- 18. The Kidnapping of Karis Richardson
- 19. Royal Canadian Mounted Police Arbitrary Detainment Pictures
- 20. Federal Court T-1403-20: Statement of Claim
- 21. Record of Determination for Asylum Interview
- 22. National Inquiry Into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls
- 23. A Métis Plea for Safety
- 24. I-589 Application for Asylum and for Withholding of Removal
- 25. Habeas Corpus Appeal Book: Volume I
- 26. Habeas Corpus Appeal Book: Volume II
- 27. Habeas Corpus Factum of the Appellant
- 28. Delaware Title 8 Documents

QUESTIONS

- 29. Is an application for writ of habeas corpus, where a person has been arbitrarily, unlawfully, and unconstitutionally detained by a government agency in violation of international instruments binding in the United States when they have committed no crimes, a civil or criminal matter?
- 30. Do judicial branches enjoy sovereign immunity, or can they be held liable for committing crimes including without limitation the forced transfer of children and the persecution of Christian, black, indigenous, and disabled women?
- 31. Do Métis have rights to their ancestral homeland in the United States?

-8-

CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

COUNT ONE

CONSTITUTIONAL CLAIM

- 32. The *Petitioner* alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 31 above.
- 33. The *Petitioner*' detainment violates her rights *guaranteed* under the *U.S. Constitution* including without limitation:

Amendment IV rights: security of person,

Amendment V rights: nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law, and

Amendment VIII rights: no cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

COUNT TWO

TREATY CLAIM

- 34. The Petitioner alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 33 above.
- 35. The *Petitioner*'s continued detainment violates the *U.S. Constitution* and the following United Nations treaties:

Article 2, 3, 7, 10, 22, 26, and 33 of the U.N. Rights of Indigenous Peoples,

Article 1 and 3 of the U.N. Torture Convention,

Article 3 and 4 of the U.N. Refugee Convention.

COUNT THREE

STATUTORY CLAIM

- 36. The Petitioner alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 35 above.
- 37. The *Petitioner*'s continued detainment violates the *U.S. Constitution*, the *U.N. Rights of Indigenous Peoples*, the *U.N. Torture Convention*, the *U.N. Refugee Convention*, and the *Immigration and Nationality Act*.

-9-

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Petitioner prays that this Court grant the following relief:

- 1. Assume jurisdiction over this matter;
- Issue a writ of habeas corpus ordering the Respondents to release the Petitioner on her own
 recognizance with all her personal effects including without limitation her Canadian passport,
 Métis citizenship card, and other identification documents, asylum and detainment
 documentation, cell phone, purse, and clothing; and
- 3. Grant any other relief which this Court deems just and proper in accordance with applicable law for both the *Petitioner* and her advocate/"any person" Robert Cannon.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT CANNON

1102 Ave L North, Saskatoon, SK CA S7L 2S1

Tel:

306 480-9473

Email:

robert.cannon@usask.ca

"ANY PERSON" FOR THE PETITIONER

Robert Cannon

VERIFICATION OF "ANY PERSON"

I, Robert Cannon, hereby certify that I am familiar with the case of the named petitioner and that the facts as stated above are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Robert Cannon

Affirmed before me at the City of Chestermere, in the Province of Alberta, in the Country of Canada, this 27th day of November, 2020.

Notary Public

ANDREW G. KEIRSTEAD Barrister, Solicitor and Notary Public



- i -

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME I	
Affidavit of "Any Person" Robert Cannon	1
Reissued Métis Card	5
Identification Provided to the United States	7
The Kidnapping of Karis Richardson	17
Royal Canadian Mounted Police Arbitrary Detainment Pictures	18
Federal Court T-1403-20: Statement of Claim	33
Record of Determination for Asylum Interview	77
National Inquiry Into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls	115
VOLUME II	
A Métis Plea for Safety	162
I-589 Application for Asylum and for Withholding of Removal	295
I-589 Form	296
Federal Court T-1115-20: Statement of Claim	309
Federal Court T-1115-20: Notice of Motion	333
Habeas Corpus Judgement of Justice Crooks, dated September 10, 2020	356
Federal Court T-1115-20: Affidavit of Dale Richardson	359
Corporate Litigation Battleford	378
Originating Application 5th Amendment	378
Draft Interim Order	388
Notice of Expedited Procedure	392
Originating Application 4th Amendment	394
VOLUME III	
Originating Application 3rd Amendment	404
Originating Application 2nd Amendment	414

Originating Application 1st Amendment	422
Originating Application	430
Corporate Communication Statement of Dale Richardson	436
Affidavit of Robert Cannon	603
VOLUME IV	
Corporate Statement of Dale Richardson	608
Habeas Corpus Appeal Book: Volume I	712
Cover	712
Pleadings	720
Application For Writ of Habeas Corpus Ad Subjiciendum	720
Application For Writ of Habeas Corpus Ad Subjiciendum Without Notice	722
Judgement of Honourable Mr. Justice G. CURRIE	726
Application For Writ of Habeas Corpus Ad Subjiciendum Without Notice	727
Judgement of Honourable Mr. Justice Currie	730
Application For Writ of Habeas Corpus Ad Subjiciendum	731
Notice of Expedited Procedure	734
Application For Writ of Habeas Corpus Ad Subjiciendum	735
Application For Writ of Habeas Corpus Ad Subjiciendum	745
Notice of Expedited Procedure	755
Application for Dispensing Service Without Notice	757
Judgement of Justice Crooks	763
Notice of Appeal	766
Application for Dispensing with Service Without Notice	770
Judgement of J.A. Schwann	778
Notice of Constitutional Questions	786

VOLUME V Affidavit of Robert Cannon......991 Affidavit of Kaysha Dery......1009 **VOLUME VI** Affidavit of Agatha Richardson......1040 Affidavit of Deron Thompson.......1045 Affidavit of Dale Richardson......1109 Corporate Statement of Dale Richardson.......1148

Affidavit of Extraordinary Condition, affirmed October 28, 2020......1274

	- iv -	
<u>vol</u>	UME VII	
	The masonic conspirators	1278
	Transnational Terrorist Financing	1319
	Forged Federal Court Form	1337
	The Engineering Technical Report	1339

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

CASE NO.	
----------	--

BETWEEN:

Kaysha Dery/Richardson, a Canadian and Métis citizen with no criminal record in any country located at 1292 95th Street, North Battleford, SK S9A 0G2 with ancestral homeland in the Provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta in the Country of Canada and the State of Montana in the Country of the United States.

(hereinafter the "Petitioner")

- and -

- 4. Attorney General of the United States;
- 5. U.S. Department of Homeland Security;
- 6. U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services;
- 7. U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement;
- 8. Scott Robinson, ZCH 193;
- 9. Nevada Southern Detention Center; and
- 10. Brian Koehn.

(hereinafter each a "Respondent", collectively, the "Respondents")

AFFIDAVIT OF "ANY PERSON" ROBERT CANNON

November 27, 2020 ROBERT CANNON

1102 Ave L North, Saskatoon, SK CA S7L 2S1

Tel: 306 480-9473

Email: robert.cannon@usask.ca

"ANY PERSON" FOR THE PETITIONER

- 2 -

TO: ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

U.S. Department of Justice, National Security Division 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20530

Tel: 202 514-2007 Email: nsd.public@usdoj.gov

Fax: 202 514-5331

AND TO: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

245 Murray Lane, SW, Washington, DC 20528-0075

Tel: 202 282-8000

AND TO: U.S. CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES

111 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, MS 2260, Washington, DC 20529-2260

AND TO: U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

500 12th Street, SW, Washington, DC 20024

AND TO: SCOTT ROBINSON, ZCH 193

Asylum Officer, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement

500 12th Street, SW, Washington, DC 20024

AND TO: **NEVADA SOUTHERN DETENTION CENTER**

2190 East Mesquite Avenue, Pahrump, NV 89060
Tel: 775-751-4500 Fax: 775-751-8763

AND TO: BRIAN KOEHN

Warden, Nevada Southern Detention Center 2190 East Mesquite Avenue, Pahrump, NV 89060 Tel: 775-751-4500 Fax: 775-751-8763

AFFIDAVIT OF "ANY PERSON" ROBERT CANNON

I, Robert Cannon, of the City of Saskatoon, of the Province of Saskatchewan, of the Country of Canada, possessing both United States and Canadian citizenship, affirm to the best of my knowledge as follows:

- 1. I represent Wisework Consulting Inc., a Canadian corporation pursuant to the *Canada Business Corporations Act* (hereinafter the "*CBCA*"), which consults for DSR Karis Consulting Inc., a Canadian corporation pursuant to the *CBCA*, and in association with consultation I have interacted with its representatives, Dale Richardson (hereinafter the "*Dale*") and Kaysha Dery/Richardson (known as the "*Petitioner*"), and I have personal and professional knowledge of the matters and facts deposed in this affidavit. The information set out in this affidavit is true to the best of my knowledge and belief, except where stated to be information learned from someone else and where that is stated, I believe the information to be true.
- 2. I managed to procure a copy of the commitment (see page 77 for the Record of Determination for the asylum interview) for these proceedings. The Petitioner has no criminal record in any country, yet is being held against her will by the foregoing commitment which is in violation of the U.S. Constitution, the U.N. Rights of Indigenous Peoples, the U.N. Torture Convention, the U.N. Refugee Convention, and the Immigration and Nationality Act.
- 3. The Petitioner fled her ancestral homeland in Canada due to unwarranted persecution on basis of religion, race, disability, gender, and political position with respect to the mismanagement of the Covid emergency (see and listen to "Kaysha Is Released from Kidnappers.m4a" in "Affidavit of Kaysha Dery August 6th Exhibits" on the USB flash drive), seeking refuge and livelihood in and around her ancestral homeland in the United States. She first pleaded with the United States officials providing evidence of her Métis heritage and the offences that occurred against her in Canada that caused her to flee (see page 162 for A Métis Plea for Safety and watch "Video of Dale Richardson and Kaysha Dery Arrested In Front of the Court House.mp4" in "Affidavit of Robert Cannon July 27th Exhibits" on the USB flash drive) and was rejected on the basis on blood quantum.
- 4. The *Petitioner* fearing for her life and the apartheid in Canada filed for asylum with an approximately 1214-page application (see page 295 for the asylum application); this application had two USB flash drives attached with the electronic evidence from the federal court T-1115-20 motion record and the electronic affidavit evidence from the *habeas corpus* proceedings which is referenced in the appeal books (see USB flash drive for the electronic evidence from the motion and the appeal book in addition to the audio recordings of the *Petitioner* while in Nevada Southern Detention Center). The *Petitioner* is currently being *arbitrarily*, *unlawful*, and *unconstitutional* detained in the Nevada Southern Detention Center in violation of *international instruments* binding in the United States.
- 5. The judicial system in the jurisdiction that the *Petitioner* is fleeing from has been demonstrated to be corrupt as Royal Canadian Mounted Police, the *national police force*, and the Courts in Saskatchewan have participated in judicial interference and unlawfully ignored evidence to dismiss cases and evidence which incriminates them (see page 712 for the appeal book which shows how Justice Crooks ignored the foregoing arrest video and all other exhibits and made

her *habeas corpus* judgments on the first hearing without considering them). The *Petitioner* is not safe in a jurisdiction which has such apartheid practices against her heritage including without limitation Métis and Caribbean. It was *unlawful* and *unconstitutional* and in violation of *international instruments* binding in the United States for Scott Robinson, ZCH 193 to seek to deport the *Petitioner* alleging that she has no credible fear in Canada, despite the *corrupt courts* which can give her orders anywhere in the country and the *national police force* which can issue a warrant and arrest her anywhere in the country on their testimony.

- 6. The mismanagement of the Covid emergency and associated terrorism is presumed to be transnational in nature based on the professional opinions of Robert Cannon (see page 1319 for transnational terrorist financing report) and Dale (see page 1339 for the engineering technical report) following the Petitioner's arbitrary, unlawful, and unconstitutional detainment in violation of international instruments binding in the United States.
- 7. The *Petitioner*'s continued *arbitrary*, *unlawful*, and *unconstitutional* detainment in violation of *international instruments* binding in the United States by *supposed* agents of the United States government is a *miscarriage of justice* and a *crime which will be punished*.

Robert Cannon

Rahert Carne

Affirmed before me at the City of Chestermere, in the Province of Alberta, in the Country of Canada, this 27th day of November, 2020.

NOTARY PUBLIC

Notary Public

ANDREW G. KEIRSTEAD Barrister, Solicitor and Notary Public

Appendix D

Ex Parte Motion for Leave to Appeal to the Supreme Court for Writ of Habeas Corpus and its appendices submitted on January 29 of this year to this Court and the resulting decision

Court of Appeal SK February 10 2021 2:30pm

00:29 ...unintelligible voices...

00:34 Robert: Yeah this is me. Yes I can hear you.

00:36 Woman's Voice: Thank you.

00:39 Justice Ottenbreit: Okay ...unintelligible.. hello Mr. Cannon.

00:40 Robert: Hello, who is this?

00:42 Justice Ottenbreit: It's Justice Offenbrite.

00:44 Robert: Offenbrig?

00:47 Justice Ottenbreit: Offspring yeah.

00:48 Robert: Ofsen or Offen?

00:50 Justice Ottenbreit: It-it's Ottenbrite, it's Ottenbreit.

00:55 Robert: Ottenbreit, Okay Ottenbri-I got it, sorry.

00:58 Justice Ottenbreit: Yeah. Well ...unintelligible... I today's uh meeting ...unintelligible... meeting here is just to ...unintelligible...that the court can do to assist in uh assist or anything, or helping or moving things forward so that's the...unintelligible... today uh talking...unintelligible... sort of a management meeting and uh I brought some information but what I understand is the appeal that you got is being scheduled for March 1st ...unintelligible... and so I hope you understand that... unintelligible... Supreme Court of Canada, so that's what I know about this case and uh you know I don't know if I can help you with anything today. But I'm sure—try to help.

02:21 Robert: Umhmm, the registrar forwarded me to you and I appreciate that because you're a judge and you have more knowledge on these matters. K so--

02:38 Justice Ottenbreit: Mr. Cannon, how can I help you to deal with ...unintelligible...

02:50 Robert: ...unintelligible... I did receive a letter for, it's the--on March 1st yes I'm aware of that um so I'll just jump right into it I guess. So first I'd like to disclose that I have no affiliation with free-masonry nor am I a free-mason myself ...unintelligible..because and that relates to this case. I'm just making that disclosure right now. I am doing this for my Christian duty because I am a Christian, I don't believe any of these types of things should happen and I'm just wanted to make that clear. So going forward as you're aware I attempted—um I submitted a motion for leave to appeal Schwann's decision. Now the major

reason for that is because since I filed the notice of appeal in this court there have been decisions by justices of this court—not yourself but other justices acting as agents of this court that have made decisions that were prejudiced against Karis. I'm refering specifically in this case to—I'm really bad with name here. You had mentioned Schwann. Yes Schwann. So before I had submitted the noticeunintelligible... (04:55) ...it's rather lengthy. I'm not sure you have time to go through that because this again was a management meeting and not an actual motion hearing. So my request to this court is that it hear this motion to make a determination to disclose prejudice and refer it to an authority that can handle dealing with it. And I had a couple of mentions here. Did you—I have a question—did you have time to read over the 10 page motion that I had submitted to the registrar or should I give you a quick brief of it?

This is where the recording of the 1st part of this interview ends and the recording of the 2nd part begins.

00:00 Robert: Alright, sounds good. So the thing that I am specifically refering to in this case uh the mechanism by which to get to the Supreme Court has to do with Schwann's decision as you informed me that you're aware of. But I would just outline specific things that I made mention of. So when I made that application to this court I did so to dispense with electronic service. Now Schwann interpreted that as a full dispensing of service entirely and thereby barred me from filing a motion for ex parte which is in compliance with the rules a well. So she mentions that she doesn't want to ambush any of the parties and all these other types of things. Escewing service would interfere with the expedious process of the hearing. Those two I wanted to make specific motion of-or sorry notice of in that this has not been an ex —it's been five months and although that might be an expedited process for the court of appeal that is not in compliance with the U.N. Torture Convention to which this case relates. And this court is responsible for it because it is binding in Canada and the courts are the mechanism by which this is to be implemented in this case. So also uh she did and I just want to make mention that she did interpret it in fact as ex parte when she did it which barred me from filing an ex parte motion because she referred to Justice Curries orders which were in fact ex parte. So this, this—yes and then I also—I did site the different rules. I'm not sure, I don't think you necessarily need them. I just did 52 for the ex parte order um I described Habeas Corpus a little here and then I made the motion itself ...unintelligible... the arguments. So I've already purported that the U.N Torture Convention was referenced in this case and that it has been violated by both the lower court and this court. Another thing that I'd like to bring to attention is the constitutional right of Habeas Corpus. Now Crooks explicitly suspended and terminated this right in chambers when she purported that Karis was under a lawful order of the court. She thereby refused to allow Karis the right of Habeas Corpus under the constitution. She did not entertain it. That right there is a constitutional violation to which this court—one of the reason I appealed to this court was because that's not allowed. And this court responded by waiting 5 months to deal with it. And that's one of the—also one of the reasons that I'm appealing because I don't think that the decision based on the evidence that Schwann made was appropriate as it is in violation of the U.N. Torture Convention and the constitution as purported. Now this court, and one of the things I made specifically mention to with

respect to the U.N. Torture Convention is because of the prejudice that was exercised by Schwann and Caldwell, this court is no longer a competent authority to hear this case and hearing a case of Habeas Corpus to begin and reviewing it with is an area of question because for example um Dale, Karis and Kaysha were all tortured within the jurisdiction of Saskatchewan and such was aquiesced to by Crooks, by Caldwell and in many ways by Schwann in her orders and bringing them back here would be by its nature not compliant with the U.N. Torture Convention because the U.N. Torture Convention talks about we're not supposed to send people back to the jurisdictions they were tortured. They were talking on a state-party level but this interpreted at international court would likely be construed as not bringing them back to the very people who tortured them anywhere in any jurisdiction of a country ...unintelligible... specifically but this court is not competent to handle this case because it failed to comply and it's implicated. So you have the U.N. Torture Convention which I mentioned to you and gave you some reasons for. I mentioned the constitutional act and how the rights um 10 were violated—the right of detention and have that validity tested by way of Habeas. That was just straight up denied and Karis is the focus of this one. I know some people have been complaining about the fact that Dale and Kaysha are no longer in detainment. Um this one's exclusively talking about the Habeas. A writ of celetari-- sorry a judicial review of what happened to them—that's--I'm not talking about that today but that needs to be done. I'm just talking about the Karis because the Habeas is still an issue for Karis. She is still in the custody of—in the custody of or held by the authority of certain respondents and I did specifically single out certain respondents in the front. I mentioned the Court of Queen's Bench for Saskatchewan, Elson, the Seventh-day Adventist Church, Matrix, Patricia, Clifford, RCMP and then the mother, Kimberly Richardson. Those are the ones I singled out specifically for this case 'cause I wanted these things tied together because again on July 23rd all of these orders were done. Uh Kaysha was taken to detainment. Dale was taken—they were taken in front of court. Karis'--the orders to take Karis away for custody were done even though she was already being detained. All of it happened and centers around July 23rd. So Crooks made errors in a dismissal—is what I purported in the application—this motion and in the notice and was already accepted and has that date of March 1. But—k let me just skip ahead here, um—yes, okay so I think there's been some kind of confusion in the lower court and this court as to how the Habeas Corpus is being handled. This is a constitutional Habeas Corpus. In the application it cites the constitutional rights being violated so it is constitutional in nature and although I do purport certain sections of Queen's Bench rules for application because—for dealing with it because you know I had to file it, right? I had to file it to a court. It is a constitutional Habeas Corpus. I just wanted to make that clear because it was purported on the first application and this what's happened here has not complied with that constitutional right. So---oh sorry were you going to say something?

06:32 Justice Ottenbreit: Yeah uh so these are all things which I suppose you could deal with on the March, on the March 1 um appearance before the court. Um on this appeal that's set for March 1, you would I think have a chance to make all of those arguments.

06:56 Robert: Well.

06:57 Justice Ottenbreit: And uh you know, file whatever you need to file and uh you'll have 3 judges there that are going to be hearing that um so these are all arguments that deal with the substance of the merits of what you're talking about but I understand that what you were a little perplexed about is this appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada ...unintelligible... Kaysha... is that still something your concern was?

07:38 Robert: Yes well, in a way yes. I'll explain here. So as I purported to you before this court is prejudiced. The court of appeal for Saskatchewan has exercised prejudice in this matter, uh 2 of it's judges. Now I'm not sure which judges are going to be presiding over that hearing but at the end of the day it doesn't matter because agents of this court are implicated—they are prejudiced. What I'm purporting in this application is they have no authority whatsoever to review this case. And that's one of the reasons I brought up discretionary power in this appeal as well is because even though this matter is —this court does not have the international or national authority to hear this case. It might by rules of the court but with respect to the U.N. Torture Convention and the constitution it has no right to review this case is what I'm purporting now and what I'm purporting now—I'm purporting this now because when I actually the notice of appeal to this court that was not the case. And to my knowledge since the factum and appeal book were submitted this is the 1st motion I've made with respect to this at introducing that prejudice and my main concern here is that what happened in the lower court should not happen here. The lower court was tasked with hearing its own matter. Justice Crooks reviewed a decision from Elson from the same level of court—from the Court of Queen's Bench for Saskatchewan. That was improper. Crooks should have referred it to this court and had this court hear it but she did not. Instead she exercised prejudice and made orders to completely dispense with the application and such violated international and national law. And my point is this court has no authority to make that decision anymore because of what happened with Caldwell and uh, and uh Schwann. See Caldwell, Caldwell determined that—and the reason I bring up Caldwell is because Crooks actually mentioned the family matter and I did bring this up in the motion as well. Crooks mentioned the family matter and said this was a family matter. The reason I applied on behalf of Karis and Dale and them is because Dale was strapped to a bed and drugged against his will without his consent. He was diagnosed with various different conditions to justify heavy medications that taxed his brain. And he was recovering from medications too even after he was taken out he could barely—his speech was even sometimes slurred because of the recovery so I filed on his behalf because he couldn't do it during the appeal period. That's why I filed a Habeas so that point that she made um was of no consequence and then after that--

10:32 Justice Ottenbreit: Okay Mr. Cannon let me interject for a minute.

10:39 Robert: Yeah.

10:40 Justice Ottenbreit: If you have a new matter that you want the court to address uh in addition to what you'd filed with your court of appeal and your factum uh what you could do with new evidence that you want to bring to the court—you could file a fresh evidence application.

10:57 Robert: Oh I know about that, and the due date for that I believe is 10 days. I have till the 19th to uh, to serve and submit that to the court. My point is that this court has no authority to hear this application to begin with because of the decisions it's made and I was mentioning Caldwell because of that, because Caldwell turned around and said that it would be prejudice to Kim to allow Dale to appeal even though he purported that he was strapped to a bed and drugged and could not represent Karis.

11:27 Justice Ottenbreit: Hmhmm.

11:28 Robert: He made an error, a fatal judicial error and exercised extreme prejudice not against Kim but for Kim. This court is implicated in all of this. In the violation of the U.N. Torture Convention and in the constitutional violation because this court has a level of discretionary authority that the lower court does not have. You have a level of dicretionary authority that the lower judges do not have so this court is held to a much higher standard. And I am purporting that this court because of that is biased. Because Caldwell is implicated, this court cannot make a proper decision so me going through the process of having it heard on March 1 instead of having it heard in the Supreme Court quickly and promptly, it's prejudice. This court cannot make a decision without prejudice. That's what I'm purporting in this motion essentially.

12:18 Justice Ottenbreit: Right, I understand that but the—you can't—I think the way the process works is that it has to go through this court first and then on to the Supreme Court of Canada. So on March the 1st the way that I understand it is that the appeal will be heard one way of the other, either with your participation ...unintelligible... if you don't participate then the justices will call the case and they'll be no one representing you and uh in that case it's open for the appeal to be dismissed on that day or I'm not sure what the judges will do on that day. I won't speak for them because I just don't know but my point is this that—if you don't appear—if you don't—if you're not ready to make your argument on March the 1st it may go on—it may be dealt with one way or the other in your absence and depending on what the ...unintelligible... is with that panel of judges um then um you know you may get the results you don't like ...unintelligible... can certainly apply—try to the Supreme Court of Canada. That's uh how the system works.

13:42 Robert: That's what I keep being told—that's how the system works. Well, one thing I would like to make abundantly clear—is this process is in direct violation of the U.N. Torture Convention. This case has not been heard promptly. No one can tell me that a man being strapped to a bed and drugged against his will, having his daughters stolen from him is not torture to him and them. No one can tell that to anyone. That is textbook torture.

14:06 Justice Ottenbreit: ...unintelligible...This sounds like a really unfortunate situation.

14:11 Robert: It is, it is and it's your duty to fix it as a court and as a judge. It is your responsibility. I'm a private citizen who's just bringing this to you and it's your responsibility to correct it.

14:23 Justice Ottenbreit: No I'm uh just letting you know the way the system works is that if you wanna go to the Supreme Court of Canada you have to sort of deal with what's happening in this court first and on March the 1st that's when the date is set for dealing with the issues, and if you wanna bring up new issues you're certainly entitled to do that 'cause you're aware of the fresh evidence application. And uh I know that the court with pure you know fresh evidence—sometimes it expects it, sometimes it doesn't. Again it's up to the panel that hears it and I don't know who'll hear it on March the 1st. Uh so um I guess what I'm saying is that if you—it probably would be to your advantage uh in terms of moving this thing forward toward the Supreme Court if you attended on March the 1st and made your arguments to the panel at that time and then depending on what their answer is or what their decision is um then you know you would—then you would have your opportunity to go to the Supreme Court. I know it takes a little longer than you maybe want it to take but uh but this is unfortunately or fortunately how the system works.

15:54 Robert: K, I'm gonna talk—I think you're done—I thank you for the explanation. Um I would like to mention that—and I do understand that is the procedure that you uh normally follow. I'm not saying that's the way the rules work. I know that's the procedure this court usually follows um but this is a case that involves torture. This court is responsible for the U.N. Torture Convention. Waiting 5 months to hear this was a violation of the U.N. Torture Convention. Even waiting past today is technically a violation of the U.N. Torture Convention. Every day that this has been delayed in every level of court has been a violation of the U.N. Torture Convention. I know it's a procedure of the court but I have handed you a legal means to get to the Supreme Court. I've handed you one that's in compliance with the rules. Under rule 40 of the Supreme Court, they can, they can uh ov—they can uh--for any final or any other judgment, they can handle that. I've handed you a motion in which you can give the authority to review the decision of Schwann to the Supreme Court and be in compliance with the rules. The only thing that I asked you to waive was the format of the application. Other than that this is in compliance with the rules that this court follows. You are able to recommend this to the Supreme Court under rule 40 and that's what I'm saying here.

17:19 Justice Ottenbreit: I don't think so. 37 of the Supreme Court Act says that the final judgment of the court and this is not a final judgment of the court. There's a distinction in the law between a single judge of the court who has limited jurisdiction—if they can only do certain things—and then the panel of ...unintelligible... and the court hears appeal and what section 37 under Supreme

Court ..unintelligible... refers to the court which I interpret as meaning the 3 person panel so there's no way that—the way I understand it—the way the process works—for a decision of Schwann—Justice Schwann to be appealed onto—the Supreme Court—it's a—I think a better way to go is to have your appeal on March the 1st then depending on what the answer is appeal it to the Supreme Court. That's my take on it. You know I don't know if I'm being helpful to you or not but that's ..unintelligible...

18:49 Robert: K, Well um I see that's your interpretation of 37 and I think that was the registrar's take on it as well. Um I'd like to restate what I said before. I'm citing rule 40 as well. In fact rule 40 is what I

mentioned in the email because and I mean you mentioned it yourself—it's an unfortunate situation. This is an extraordinary circumstance. The authority of the Supreme Court can take charge in these kinds of cases especially when it's a matter of importance and involves questions of law. I actually would like to read section 40 here. It's only a paragraph. It says subject to section 3, an appeal lies to the Supreme Court for many final or other judgment of a federal court of appeal or the highest court of the final resort in a province or judge thereof in which judgement can be had in a particular case sought to be appealed to the Supreme Court whether or not leave to the Supreme Court has been refused by any other court. Where with respect to the particular case sought to be appealed, the Supreme Court is of the opinion that any question involved therein by reason of its public importance or the importance of any issue of law or any issue of mixed law and fact involved in that question, one that ought to be decided by the Supreme Court or is for any other reason of such a nature or significance as to warrant decision by it and leave to appeal from that judgment is accordingly granted by the Supreme Court. What I'm asking for is for this court to disclose its prejudice and recommend that this be filed to the Supreme Court under rule 40. That's really what my focus is here at this point, given what's been purported by the registrar and by you because this court is prejudiced and I want this court to recognize its prejudice and forward it to the Supreme Court and ask that it be handled promptly because I'm just a private citizen, right? You're a judge. If you give that recommendation to the Supreme Court, for example—you look at the circumstances—you see that this court has violated the U.N. Torture Convention and that it's prejudiced and you give that recommendation then the Supreme Court is gonna take it more seriously than if I do. You see what I'm saying there?

21:02 Justice Ottenbreit: Yeah, you know you can make those arguments on March the 1st and then when the court makes the decision it will be a final decision of the court to which you will have a right of appeal to the Supreme Court—uh you would have a right to make an application for leave to appeal. The ...unintelligible... is that—everything—it talks about a final ...unintelligible... talk about a final decision but a final decision on this will be the decision that comes out of that March 1 appeal. And once that happens then you have your chance to appeal to the Supreme Court. I can't do it. No single judge of this court can do it but it has to go through the 3 person panel and a final decision has to be made on it and then you get your crack at the Supreme Court. So that's how I understand it. I—that's—you know—the arguments ...unintelligible... that you're gonna make but you're going to have to make them to the panel on March the 1st uh and uh see what transpires--see what decision they're going to make on it. So that's all I can tell you sir. Uh that's uh you know I would think it would be in your interest to actually appear and argue the case on March the 1st and you know give it your best shot at that time and there may be things that the court can do for you at that time uh or no--I know that um the court would be probably very helpful to you in terms of presenting your arguments at that time.

23:01 Robert: Well, I mean obviously I'm not going to shirk and leave because a child is being tortured and the parent thereof so I'm going to do everything within my power and exercise—so through Christian

duty and through the power of Christ do so. I'm not going to stop that's for sure but my point to this court was that—sorry what? I was--

23:26 Justice Ottenbreit: ...unintelligible... Oh I'm not suggesting you do that um not at all. I was suggesting that on—you just make sure that you make your arguments on March the 1st and when the court makes its decision that will be a final decision and then you'll have your chance to apply for leave to the Supreme Court of Canada. That's what that—I think your best shot at it if you want to get to Supreme Court.

23:55 Robert: K so—yeah well here's the thing that I'd like to just bring up here for a second. So my appeal in this case is to—and this is probably my final point I think unless I've something more comes to mind but—if this court is reviewing the decision of Crooks to just arbitrarily shut down the writ for Karis and purport that Kim stealing Karis before the hearing was of no consequence and it was no proof. That was the appeal—her suspension of this. Now if this court turns around and decides that—I mean this case is so bad and the evidence is so bad that any reasonable person who looks at it will determine that what happened was not right so how is this court going to deal with it? If I go there on March 1st this court —my argument and right now to you was and is that this court is not competent to actually review or handle the writ. So this court is not competent to issue the writ for Karis and then investigate it.

25:06 Justice Ottenbreit: Well I understand that.

25:08 Robert: Umhmm that was my argument to you.

25:12 Justice Ottenbreit: But you'll have to make that argument to the panel because they're the only ones that can give you a final decision that you can take to the Supreme Court. You make that argument, I mean if you think the court on March the 1st, the court is not competent, you make that argument to them and then you know there'll be--whatever decision they make that will be a final decision you can take to the Supreme Court—that's what I'm saying.

25:41 Robert: So I wanted to confirm something with you um so the hearing is on March 1. I believe there are 31 day—was it 30—was it 30 or 31 days—I think it's the nin—I calculated the 19th. So there's 28 days in February, so the 19th. If I get in accordance with Schwann's orders if I get this mailed out by or on the 19th, then that's in enough time for the March 1 date, correct?

26:19 Justice Ottenbreit: Oh you're talking about the fresh evidence application?

26:22 Robert: Yes

26:24 Justice Ottenbreit: Yeah uh you get it a—19th till the 28th um nine to—I would mail it out on—I would mail it out on the 18th.

26:36 Robert: K so--

26:36 Justice Ottenbreit: That gives you 10 days—10 days—I think it's 10 clear days uh so that doesn't include March the 1st. So that gives—I think that would give you 10 days.

26:48 Robert: K so if I so it by February 18 for fresh evidence, K? And in that I can make a motion and mention all of these things then.

26:52 Justice Ottenbreit: Yes. Yeah if you can. You can add—you can try to add that—and like I say the panel—the panel have to deal with the motion one way or the other and uh so the um material would have to be served and uh do you file your material electronically, yeah?

27:27 Robert: Um I can't for some reason. I tried but my internet might be too slow. I'm not sure so I'll probably end up submitting it by paper and email.

27:39 Justice Ottenbreit: Okay so let's get it served by February the 18th, and if you can file it by February the uh—if you get it all served before the 18th that's great but file it by February ei—serve and file by February the 18th and if you're uh if you haven't—if you've served it by February the 18th I think that's the most important thing. Even if you filed it a couple of days late um you know ...unintelligible.. you could ask uh the clerk at that point to ask whoever is on the panel, determine the panel to allow you to uh file it uh you know a few days late if you have to file it hard copy.

28:23 Robert: K

28:24 Justice Ottenbreit: As long as you serve it by February the 18th I think that's probably the most important thing.

28:33 Robert: Okay so basicly and I'm just going to summarize this whole kind of meeting from my perspective. So I brought forward this motion. I mentioned the U.N. Torture violations in this court and the lower court. I mentioned the constitutional violations in both. I mentioned the prejudice that it should be appealed to the higher court. Um I want to bring this motion forward now to you in fact but correct me if I'm wrong about this—you're saying it's not the procedure of the court and that you do not have the authority to do that and that it has to go before the panel. So the court--

29:06 Justice Ottenbreit: That's right. I don't have the authority to send it off to the Supreme Court of Canada um the way to do this is to bring these things up before the panel on March the 1st and uh then they will render a decision which will be a final decision and then you will have it uh you will have a chance to apply to the Supreme Court of Canada for leave to appeal.

29:31 Robert: So you can't accept this motion then?

29:33 Justice Ottenbreit: I, I—yeah, because I don't—I don't have the authority to ...unintelligible... the Supreme Court of Canada. That's my take on it.

29:42 Robert: K and you won't write a recommendation for it either?

29:47 Justice Ottenbreit: Well no I mean a judge's recommendation is a decision an I have no authority to do any of that. Uh you know I guess I have the power—my power is limited by what statutory power I have either in the court of appeal act or the rules or the Supreme Court Act and the way that things are interpreted. I, I interpret it and it's been interpreted. I don't have the power to circumvent the panel hearing and sending it off to the Supreme Court of Canada. That's my take on it but I you know I hope that you're able to serve this other material by the 18th and get it ...unintelligible... and then ...unintelligible... final decision and you can appeal that to the Supreme Court. That's how you get to Supreme Court. Right?

30:56 Robert: Um yeah you mentioned that. So March 1—how long does it take the court to make its decision usually?

31:02 Justice Ottenbreit: It's up to the panel uh I, you know, some take a quick decision, some they make—it takes a little bit longer to make a decision. Depends on the complexity the g, uh depends on a whole number of factors and you know I—it's hard to predict. I've been involved in a case where it's taken months to render a decision and some cases where it's taken a couple a weeks and some you can render —you know you can make a decision on the day. Uh but it really very depends on what the issues are and what the panel believes, I—you know, I can't predict. It really is up to the panel.

31:48 Robert: Yeah so it can take time is what you're saying but you don't know. It can take whatever the court decides. Okay I'm just saying because it's been a long process. It's been probably 7 months maybe ...unintelligible.. at least 5. It's been quite a lengthy process. I thank you for talking with me about this.

32:08 Justice Ottenbreit: ...unintelligible... well I hope I've been helpful on it and and uh you know I think your best bet is to serve the new material, for the March 1 date appear, make your argument and that will really be—once the court makes its decision and that'll be your ticket if you want to go to Supreme Court. Alright?

32:36 Robert: K. I thank you so much for your time and I appreciate and uh how you've helped me—or you know walked me through the procedures of the court. I feel kinda bad but I have to say this anyway. What this court's done thus far has been a violation of the U.N. Torture Convention and you're a really nice guy and it makes me feel kinda bad but if this gets delayed longer there is no defense for it either under Canadian law or under international law for any of the parties involved and I'm just making that clear to you so that you know um 'cause you're a local judge. I'm not sure if you're aware of the laws relation to torture but there is no defense. Even procedure cannot defend an officer of the court or the officer of any, or any official in government uh from torture. I just wanted to make that clear so that you're aware and that you incorporate that into your decision.

33:31 Justice Ottenbreit: No I understand that. I hope I've been able to help you in some way and uh move it forward but I think your best bet on this uh to make your—get your arguments heard is the March 1 hearing. Alright?

33:48 Robert: Alright well that's everything that I had to say uh did you actually have a—I did have one question before we go—did you actually have a copy of the motion? Did you actually see the motion in any way shape or form?

34:00 Justice Ottenbreit: Actually I pulled up the material here that had been filed uh yes I—just a minute here let me just see what uh it begins—um yeah it's a ex parte motion for the interim appeal. It's filed by Robert A. Cannon on behalf of Karis and Kaya and Richardson the detainee. Uh yeah and then there's a number of pages after that but of course I'm not hearing it as a motion—management meeting to tell—help you out. but I'm aware that it's been filed with the court, yeah.

34:39 Robert: Umhmm. K well if anything comes up you can contact me by this phone or that email, if anything comes to mind or anything like that. And I appreciate all the help that you've given me and I hope this can be resolved speedily.

35:00 Justice Ottenbreit: Yeah I uh—like I say give it a crack on March 1, and uh it's good to be diligent about filing your stuff by February the 18th and uh if you're getting it in on time then the panel will hear it and uh you know you can deal with ...unintelligible...

35:23 Robert: K

35:24 Justice Ottenbreit: Alright?

35:25 Robert: Well you do what you have to do. I'm just a citizen right? I have no powers to do anything else so I'll give it a crack.

35:34 Justice Ottenbreit: Okay, alright thanks so much.

35:35 Robert: Bye.

35:36 Justice Ottenbreit: Bye, bye.

Subject: RE: Registrar: Avoiding Prejudice in the Motion for Leave to the

Supreme Court

From: "Registrar, Court of Appeal" <CARegistrar@sasklawcourts.ca>

Date: 2/10/21, 9:53 AM

To: Robert Cannon <robert.cannon@usask.ca>

Thank you. You will be called at 2:30 or perhaps a few minutes after that time, since there are a number of Chambers matters today.

Regards, Amy Groothuis

From: Robert Cannon <robert.cannon@usask.ca>

Sent: February 9, 2021 2:24 PM

To: Registrar, Court of Appeal <CARegistrar@sasklawcourts.ca>

Subject: Re: Registrar: Avoiding Prejudice in the Motion for Leave to the Supreme Court

Dear Amy Groothius, Registrar:

The telephone number to reach me at is 306-480-9473 on February 10, 2021 at 2:30 pm.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Robert Cannon

On 2/9/21 10:56 AM, Registrar, Court of Appeal wrote:

Mr. Cannon,

This matter has been scheduled for an appearance in Chambers tomorrow, February 10, 2021 at 2:30 pm. This is not an application that is being heard, because the parties have not been served, but rather a management meeting to discuss the state of your matter. You will have an opportunity to speak with the Chambers judge on your request, and I confirm that I have forwarded your materials to the Chambers judge.

<u>Please provide us with a telephone number at which you can be reached</u> at 2:30 tomorrow, and you will be called at that time.

If you have any questions on the above, please let me know.

Regards, Amy

From: Robert Cannon < robert.cannon@usask.ca>

Sent: February 9, 2021 1:41 AM

To: Registrar, Court of Appeal <CARegistrar@sasklawcourts.ca>

Subject: Re: Registrar: Avoiding Prejudice in the Motion for Leave to the

Supreme Court

Dear Amy Groothius, Registrar:

You are a duly authorized representative of the Court of Appeal of Saskatchewan (this Court) with discretionary power to put these purports of torture before a judge.

Court of Appeal Act Section 21

21(1) The registrar may exercise any power or jurisdiction of a judge sitting in chambers that may be conferred on the registrar by the rules of court.

- (2) For the purposes of subsection (1), "registrar" does not include a deputy registrar.
- (3) The Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations prescribing the fees and charges payable to the registrar.

Court of Appeal Rules Section 60

60(1) The registrar may hear and determine applications under Rules 10(2) (Filing notice of appeal), 18 (Appeal book required), 22(5) (Agreement as to contents and completion of appeal book), 28(1) (Contents of factum), 34(1) (Late filing of factum), or 43(3) (Content of appeal book on expedited appeal).

(2) Any matter arising before the registrar may be referred by the registrar to a judge for a decision by the judge.

Further suspension will constitute further violation of the UN Torture Convention; duly authorized representatives of this Court have exercised *prejudice* in this *application for a writ of habeas corpus* and thereby is not a *competent authority* under the convention to review such application; such representatives include without limitation: JUSTICE J.A. SCHWANN and JUSTICE J.A. CALDWELL.

This conversation has thus far been fruitless as you, a duly authorized representative of this Court with discretionary power, have continued to delay lawful action under the guise law, this is in contravention to statuary, constitutional, and international law binding in Canada. I shall

take your next response (or lack there of) as your final answer.

People make their own choices and bare their own consequences, this is God's way.

Sincerely,

Robert Cannon.

On 2/8/21 9:34 AM, Registrar, Court of Appeal wrote:

Good morning Mr. Cannon,

Thank you for your follow up email correspondence, I hope I can be of assistance in providing this reply. The *Supreme Court Act* applies to seeking leave to the Supreme Court of Canada, whereas *The Rules of Court* (including R.4 which you cite below) applies to the Court of Appeal. Practically, this means that I cannot rely on rule 4(1) to waive compliance or relieve against non-compliance with the requirements of the *Supreme Court Act*.

If I have misunderstood you and you are instead asking me to waive non-compliance with the Rules in order to rely upon Rule 20(3) which as I've noted allows the Court to discharge or vary an order on a motion brought by a party, this is not something that I as Registrar have the authority to do. Only a Justice of the Court of Appeal has the authority to waive compliance or relieve against non-compliance as permitted by Rule 4(1).

Finally, and while I am in no way offering you any legal advice, I would gently and respectfully ask whether bringing this type of motion is strictly necessary, since you have complied with Justice Schwann's order regarding service, and your appeal has been perfected and set down for a hearing. While you are of course able to bring any procedural motion you consider appropriate, I would note that whether you seek leave to appeal to the Supreme Court or you seek to file a motion to vary Justice Schwann's October 16, 2020 decision regarding dispensing with service for future filings, you have served your materials related to the hearing on the merits, which will be heard on March 1. I only identify this point in order to further explain the process, which may be of some assistance.

Regards, Amy Groothuis

From: Robert Cannon robert.cannon@usask.ca

Sent: February 5, 2021 4:29 PM

To: Registrar, Court of Appeal <u><CARegistrar@sasklawcourts.ca</u>> **Subject:** Re: Registrar: Avoiding Prejudice in the Motion for Leave

to the Supreme Court

Dear Amy Groothius, Registrar:

I appreciate your understanding of the rules; however, I must respectfully protest this Court's decision to refuse to entertain this motion as such is a violation of the Canadian Constitution and International Law binding in Canada. This is the reason Court's are given discretionary powers to dispense the rules which was the basis of this motion which petitioned for orders of "waiving compliance with the rules of this Court for the foregoing pursuant to subsection 4(1) of the rules of this Court; such motion is made to uphold the "supremacy of God and the rule of law"."

Application of the rules

4(1) Where it is in the interests of the proper administration of justice to do so, the court or a judge may waive compliance or relieve against noncompliance with these rules and direct the procedure to be followed.

I must respectfully request that this Court reconsider it decision, and that you give this motion to a justice or this Court to consider the same, and that no person with Freemason leanings be involved in such process.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Robert Cannon.

On 2/5/21 10:24 AM, Registrar, Court of Appeal wrote:

Mr. Cannon,

I have had an occasion to review your materials again, and to consider the four emails you have sent me on February 4 and 5, 2021.

You are seeking leave to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada, from a decision of a judge of the Court of

Appeal for Saskatchewan. Section 37 of *The Supreme Court Act* reads:

37 Subject to sections 39 and 42, an appeal to the Supreme Court lies with leave of the highest court of final resort in a province from <u>a final judgment of that court</u> where, in the opinion of that court, the question involved in the appeal is one that ought to be submitted to the Supreme Court for decision..

In limited circumstances, section 37 allows a party to apply to the Court of Appeal for Saskatchewan, for leave to appeal a decision of the court to the Supreme Court of Canada. However, the decision on which you are seeking leave to appeal is not a decision of the court; it is a decision of one judge. As such, section 37 does not apply in the current situation and you cannot rely on it to file your materials with the Court of Appeal's Registry. If you want leave to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada, you must file that leave application with the Supreme Court of Canada's registry (I provided that contact information to you in my correspondence of February 3, 2021), relying upon section 40 of The Supreme Court Act. Section 40 applies to those matters when a party is seeking leave to appeal to the Supreme Court (that is, not via a lower court as permitted in limited circumstances by s. 37 of that Act). As such, the Registry is unable to accept your materials for filing and we are in the process of returning the hard copy of those documents to you. However, I also point you to s. 20(3) of The Court of Appeal Act, which reads:

20(3) An order made by a judge in chambers, other than an order granting or denying leave to appeal, may be discharged or varied by the court.

Section 20(3) allows you to bring an application to vary Justice Schwann's October 16, 2020 decision regarding dispensing with service for future filings, which would be set down and heard by a full panel of the Court of Appeal. However, I caution that if you decide to bring an application for relief under s. 20(3), namely to vary Justice Schwann's order, you must serve it on the other parties and then file the application returnable on a

date to be set by the registrar.

I trust the above provides you with the information and direction you need in order to decide how to proceed with respect to Justice Schwann's October 16, 2020 decision. However, if you have any additional questions please let us know and we are happy to assist.

Regards, Amy Groothuis Registrar

From: Robert Cannon <a href="mailto:cobert.cannon@usask.ca>

Sent: February 5, 2021 1:21 AM **To:** Registrar, Court of Appeal <CARegistrar@sasklawcourts.ca>

Subject: Registrar: Avoiding Prejudice in the Motion for

Leave to the Supreme Court

Dear Amy Groothius, Registrar:

I must respectfully ask that this application be made to the Court of Appeal for Saskatchewan (this Court) as section 40 of the *Supreme Court Act* purports. It is true that I am able to apply "whether or not leave to appeal to the Supreme Court has been refused by any other court"; however, I do not seek to "ambush" this Court and receiving a *prompt* leave to appeal to the Supreme Court from a Justice of this Court will help to further justice: as it will demonstrate that this Court believes that the application has merit and will demonstrate this Court's willingness to recognize its prejudice.

P.S:

Given that you have been recently appointed and perhaps unfamiliar with prior rulings, I must respectfully ask that neither JUSTICE J.A. SCHWANN nor JUSTICE J.A. CALDWELL of this Court preside over this application given their prior acquiescence to the torture of KARIS K.N. RICHARDSON as punishment for her father DALE J.S. RICHARDSON whistle-blowing the mismanagement of the Covid

emergency and the *suspension* of her Charter rights with *extreme prejudice*.

I would also like to note in reference to your statement "Note that your application for leave to the Supreme Court does not in any way impact or affect the current appeal hearing": this application should be put before a Justice of this Court promptly, as it is inappropriate for a Writ of Habeas Corpus, which by its very nature orders a person to appear before the Court, to be considered in a jurisdiction responsible for torturing KARIS K.N. RICHARDSON in accordance with the UN Torture Convention.

P.S.2:

I am a Bible believing Seventh-Day Adventist who follows the counsel of Ellen G. White who says we are to have no dealings with Freemasons and putting me in front of a Justice with Freemason leanings would be *extreme prejudice*.

Sincerely,

Robert Cannon

----- Forwarded Message ------

Subject:Fwd: Re: Motion for Leave to the Supreme Court of Canada and Complaint to the Privy Council

Date:Thu, 4 Feb 2021 23:43:42 -0600

From:Robert Cannon <a href="mailto:cobert.cannon@usask.ca>

To: Registrar, Court of Appeal

<CARegistrar@sasklawcourts.ca>

Dear Amy Groothius:

I must respectfully ask that this application be made to the Court of Appeal for Saskatchewan (this Court) as section 40 of the *Supreme Court Act* purports. It is true that I am able to apply "whether or not leave to appeal to the Supreme Court has been refused by any other court"; however, I do

not seek to "ambush" this Court and receiving a prompt leave to appeal to the Supreme Court from a Justice of this Court will help to further justice: as it will demonstrate that this Court believes that the application has merit and will demonstrate this Court's willingness to recognize its prejudice.

P.S:

Given that you have been recently appointed and perhaps unfamiliar with prior rulings, I must respectfully ask that neither JUSTICE J.A. SCHWANN nor JUSTICE J.A. CALDWELL of this Court preside over this application given their prior acquiescence to the torture of KARIS K.N. RICHARDSON as punishment for her father DALE J.S. RICHARDSON whistle-blowing the mismanagement of the Covid emergency and the suspension of her Charter rights with extreme prejudice.

I would also like to note in reference to your statement "Note that your application for leave to the Supreme Court does not in any way impact or affect the current appeal hearing": this application should be put before a Justice of this Court promptly, as it is inappropriate for a Writ of Habeas Corpus, which by its very nature orders a person to appear before the Court, to be considered in a jurisdiction responsible for torturing KARIS K.N. RICHARDSON in accordance with the UN Torture Convention.

Sincerely,

Robert Cannon

----- Forwarded Message ------

Subject:Re: Motion for Leave to the Supreme Court of Canada and Complaint to the Privy Council

Date:Thu, 4 Feb 2021 21:31:15 -0600

From:Robert Cannon <a href="mailto:continue"

To:Registrar, Court of Appeal <CARegistrar@sasklawcourts.ca>

Dear Amy Groothius:

I must respectfully ask that this application be made to the Court of Appeal for Saskatchewan (this Court) as section 40 of the Supreme Court Act purports. It is true that I am able to apply "whether or not leave to appeal to the Supreme Court has been refused by any other court"; however, I do not seek to "ambush" this Court and receiving a prompt leave to appeal to the Supreme Court from a Justice of this Court will help to further justice: as it will demonstrate that this Court believes that the application has merit and will demonstrate this Court's willingness to recognize its prejudice.

Sincerely,

Robert Cannon.

On 2/3/21 3:38 PM, Registrar, Court of Appeal wrote:

Good afternoon Mr. Cannon,

Please see the attached.

Thank you

Registry Office

Court of Appeal for Saskatchewan

Victoria

Direct: 306.787.5382

Avenue

Email:

Court House caregistrar@sasklawcourts.ca www.sasklawcourts.ca

2425

Victoria

Avenue

Regina

SK S4P

4W6

From: Robert Cannon <robert.cannon@usask.ca>

Sent: February 3, 2021 2:23 PM To: Registrar, Court of Appeal <CARegistrar@sasklawcourts.ca> Subject: Re: Motion for Leave to the Supreme Court of Canada and Complaint to the Privy Council

To COURT OF APPEAL:

Pursuant to section 40 of the Supreme Court Act, I am requesting leave to the Supreme Court of Canada in the Court of Appeal as cited in the motion specifies.

Thank you.

On 2/1/21 9:09 AM, Registrar, Court of Appeal wrote:

> CAUTION: External to USask, Verify sender and use caution with links and attachments. Forward suspicious emails to phishing@usask.ca

Good morning Mr. Cannon,

Is this for filing with the Supreme Court?

Please advise.

Registry Office

Court of Appeal for Saskatchewan

Victoria Direct: 306.787.5382

Avenue Email:

caregistrar@sasklawcourts.ca Court www.sasklawcourts.ca

House 2425

Victoria Avenue Regina

SK S4P

4W6

From: Cannon, Robert <robert.cannon@usask.ca> Sent: January 29, 2021 9:41 PM To: Registrar, Court of Appeal <CARegistrar@sasklawcourts.ca> ; info@pco-bcp.qc.ca

Subject: Motion for Leave to the Supreme Court of Canada and Complaint to the Privy Council

To COURT OF APPEAL FOR SASKATCHEWAN:

I was unable to use the online ecourt system as the uploads and processing timed out. I have provided links to the motion below which I wish to submit in the habeas corpus. The original and three copies in route via mail. Please file the motion and provide instructions for fee payment. Thank you.

To CLERK OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL:

Please forward the motion for leave to the Privy Council as it purports justices and judges acting in gross contravention to justice and such is the duty of the clerk to pass complaints of justices and judges to the council. Thank you.

application_leave_to_appeal_without

RE: Registrar: Avoiding	Prejudice in the Motion fo	
	ve to appeal without	
	ve to appeal without	
	ve to appeal without	
	annication leave to appeal without	
	notice 2101	
	notice 2101	
	ve to appeal without	
	Sincerely,	
	Randice to appeal without	
	_notice_2101	
	_notice_2101	
12 of 12		2/16/21, 4:35 AM

No. CACV3708

In The Court of Appeal for Saskatchewan

ROBERT A. CANNON

Appellant,

On behalf of



KARIS K.N. RICHARDSON

Detainee,

٧.

COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH FOR SASKATCHEWAN,
HONOURABLE J.W. ELSON,
THE BATTLEFORDS SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST CHURCH,
MATRIX LAW GROUP,
PATRICIA J. MEIKLEJOHN,
CLIFFORD HOLM,
ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE,
KIMBERLEY RICHARDSON, ET AL.

Respondents.

Ex Parte Motion for Leave to Appeal to the Supreme Court for Writ of Habeas Corpus

ROBERT A. CANNON 1102 Ave L North, Saskatoon, SK S7L 2S1

Saskatoon, SK S7L 2S1, Canada Tel: 1 306 480-9473

Email: robert.cannon@usask.ca

I. INTRODUCTION

- 1. This Ex Parte Motion for Leave to Appeal to the Supreme Court for Writ of Habeas Corpus ("Motion for Leave") is filed by ROBERT A. CANNON (the "Appellant") on behalf of KARIS K.N. RICHARDSON (the "Detainee") against the MASONIC conspirators which are using their authority to unlawfully detain her to torture her and her father DALE J.S. RICHARDSON ("DALE") for his whistleblowing of the mismanagement of the Covid emergency, such MASONIC conspirators specifically include: COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH FOR SASKATCHEWAN, JUSTICE R.W. ELSON, the BATTLEFORDS SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST CHURCH, MATRIX LAW GROUP LLP, PATRICIA J. MEIKLEJOHN, CLIFFORD A. HOLM, ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE, KIMBERLEY A. RICHARDSON, et al. (the "Respondents").
- 2. Specifically, this *Motion for Leave* addresses the following issues raised by JUSTICE J.A. SCHWANN of this Court at the first and *final* hearing of this matter on October 5, 2020, namely:
 - [17] The second part of Mr. Cannon's application is more problematic to the extent he truly seeks an order dispensing with service. <u>Like Currie and Crooks JJ.</u>, I am not prepared to grant an order dispensing with service of the further documents required to perfect his appeal. The procedural steps in this Court leading to an appeal hearing are considerably less diverse and more linear than those in the Court of Queen's Bench. On a go-forward basis assuming there are no further interlocutory applications the next step is for Mr. Cannon to serve and file his appeal book and factum: see Rules 26, 27, 32, 35 and 43.
 - [18] It is self-evident that if service of these documents on the respondents was dispensed with, the respondents would not know the case they had to meet on appeal and that the panel hearing the appeal would not have the benefit of their submissions. This Court does not operate on the footing of appeal by ambush and adheres to the principle that a party is entitled to know and respond to the case against them.
 - [19] Furthermore, service of the appeal book and factum serves the important function of signalling when a respondent must file their response factum. By way of illustration, in relation to an expedited appeal, Rule 43(2)(c) requires a respondent to serve and file its factum within 15 days after receipt of the appellants appeal book and factum. Eschewing service would interfere with the appellate process and the expeditious hearing of this appeal.
- 3. In the Appellant's respectful submission, the following relief was requested, namely:
 - 1) The <u>Writ of Habeas Corpus ad subjiciendum</u> will be directed to the Respondents and to all officers and employees of the Respondents who have Dale Richardson, Kaysha Dery, <u>Karis Richardson</u>, or Christy Dawn Pembrun in their charge or detained in their custody by whatever name he or she may be called to have Dale Richardson, Kaysha Dery, Karis Richardson, and Christy Dawn Pembrun before a judge in chambers at the Court House, Court of

Queen's Bench, Judicial Center of Saskatoon, 520 Spadina Crescent E, Saskatoon, S7K 3G7, Saskatchewan immediately, that this Court may then and there examine and determine the validity of that detention.

- 2) For the forgoing, that Dale Richardson, Kaysha Dery, <u>Karis Richardson</u>, and Christy Dawn Pembrun be brought in person before such judge in chambers at the Court House, Court of Queen's Bench, Judicial Center of Saskatoon, 520 Spadina Crescent E, Saskatoon, S7K 3G7, Saskatchewan.
- 4. The Appellant would like to direct attention to the section 50 of the rules of this Court with respect to the issue of "This Court does not operate on the footing of appeal by ambush" raised by JUSTICE J.A. SCHWANN, namely:
 - **50**(1) An application to the court for a prerogative writ of *mandamus*, for a writ of *certiorari* or order to quash proceedings without the actual issue of the writ, for a writ of *habeas corpus*, for prohibition, or for an information in the nature of a *quo warranto* shall be made by notice of motion, in accordance with the practice of this court.
 - (2) The court may grant ex parte an order for the immediate issue of a writ of habeas corpus.
 - (3) A party making an application under this rule shall file the address information required by rule 65 (Address for service).
- 5. The nature of a *Writ of Habeas Corpus* is preventative and seeks only to bring the person named before court for an investigation into validity of their detainment; such is not an "ambush", but a crucial mechanism to prevent unlawful detainment and *torture* as understood by rule 50 of this Court in permitting *ex parte*. JUSTICE J.A. SCHWANN clearly interpreted the application for dispensing with service as *ex parte* (the "*First Motion*") by associating it with JUSTICE G. CURRIE's order to dismiss the *ex parte* application for *Writ of Habeas Corpus* purporting that service would be required.
- 6. The Privilege of Writ of Habeas Corpus guarantees that "You shall have the body" and when an Application for a Writ of Habeas Corpus is submitted to a court, justice, or judge on your behalf, the same shall forthwith direct the Writ to any person who has seized or imprisoned you, such person must bring or cause your body to be brought before the same within three days, unless distance requires additional time, for an investigation into the lawfulness of your seizure or imprisonment.
- 7. This Motion for Leave is made for (1) leave to appeal JUSTICE J.A. SCHWANN'S first and final decision, in part, to the SUPREME COURT OF CANADA pursuant to sections 37 and 60 of the Supreme Court Act, specifically her decision to dismiss hearing the matter ex parte for the Detainee, (2) an extension of time for appeal pursuant to section 59(1) of the same, and (3)

waiving compliance with the rules of this Court for the foregoing pursuant to subsection 4(1) of the rules of this Court; the foregoing rules and acts are as follows:

Rules of this Court

4 (1) Where it is in the interests of the proper administration of justice to do so, the court or a judge may waive compliance or relieve against non-compliance with these rules and direct the procedure to be followed.

Supreme Court Act

- **37** Subject to sections 39 and 42, an appeal to the Supreme Court lies with leave of the highest court of final resort in a province from a final judgment of that court where, in the opinion of that court, the question involved in the appeal is one that ought to be submitted to the Supreme Court for decision.
- **59** (1) Notwithstanding anything in this Act or any other Act of Parliament, the court proposed to be appealed from or any judge thereof or the Supreme Court or a judge thereof may under special circumstances, either before or after the expiration of a time period prescribed by section 58, extend that time period.
- 60 (1) An appeal shall be brought, within the time prescribed by section 58 or allowed under section 59, by
 - (a) serving a notice of appeal on all parties directly affected; and
 - (b) depositing with the Registrar security to the value of five hundred dollars that the appellant will effectually prosecute the appeal and pay such costs and damages as may be awarded against the appellant by the Court.

II. ARGUMENTS

A. This Court Has Failed to Comply with the UN Torture Convention

8. The Appellant would like to direct attention to the article 12 and 13 of the UNITED NATIONS

Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment

(the "UN Torture Convention") which is an international instrument binding in CANADA and applies to this application as it purported torture of the Detainee and others, namely:

Article 12

Each State Party shall ensure that its competent authorities proceed to a prompt and impartial investigation, wherever there is reasonable ground to believe that an act of torture has been committed in any territory under its jurisdiction.

Article 13

Each State Party shall ensure that any individual who alleges he has been subjected to torture in any territory under its jurisdiction has the right to complain to, and to have his case promptly and impartially examined by, its competent authorities. Steps shall be taken to ensure that the complainant and witnesses are protected against all ill-treatment or intimidation as a consequence of his complaint or any evidence given.

- 9. The Appellant would like to direct attention to the date of the hearing for the appeal which is March 1, 2021 as this date is nearly five months past the First Motion on October 5, 2020 which constitutes suspension of the Privilege of Writ of Habeas Corpus; making matters worse, the application is for the Detainee, an infant child, being purportedly subjected to unlawful detainment and torture by JUSTICE R.W. ELSON, a COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH FOR SASKATCHEWAN official, in separating her from DALE, her father and primary caregiver without cause, since July 23, 2020.
- 10. By virtue, the date of the hearing for the appeal is not expeditious contradicting the issue of "Eschewing service would interfere with the appellate process and the expeditious hearing of this appeal" raised by JUSTICE J.A. SCHWANN and is in violation of the UN Torture Convention, specifically: "Each State Party shall ensure that any individual who alleges he has been subjected to torture in any territory under its jurisdiction has the right to complain to, and to have his case promptly and impartially examined by, its competent authorities".
- 11. If the Writ of Habeas Corpus had been issued ex parte in accordance with the UN Torture Convention, the Constitution Act, 1982, and the rules of this Court, an investigation would have been conducted within days into the unlawful detainment and torture of the Detainee and others as punishment for her father whistleblowing the mismanagement of the Covid emergency.
- B. This Court Has Failed to Comply with the Constitution Act, 1982
- 12. The Appellant would like to direct attention to the sections 9 and 10 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (the "Charter"), Part I of the Constitution Act, 1982, being Schedule B to the Canada Act 1982 (U.K.), 1982, chapter 11 which were denied to the Detainee by JUSTICE N.D. CROOKS of COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH FOR SASKATCHEWAN in a effort to preserve judicial immunity, namely:
 - 9. Everyone has the right not to be arbitrarily detained or imprisoned.
 - 10. Everyone has the right on arrest or detention
 - (a) to be informed promptly of the reasons therefor;
 - (b) to retain and instruct counsel without delay and to be informed of that right; and

- (c) to have the validity of the detention determined by way of habeas corpus and to be released if the detention is not lawful.
- 13. Specifically, the foregoing rights were denied with the dismissal of the application for Writ of Habeas Corpus without an investigation in JUSTICE N.D. CROOKS's orders as follows:
 - [2] Mr. Cannon has brought an application to dispense with service of the application for a writ of habeas corpus ad subjiciendum. The respondents who appeared, though their respective counsel, did not concede they had been properly served.
 - [3] Service in compliance with *The Queen's Bench Rules* was ordered previously by Currie J. on July 28, 2020 and July 29, 2020. The grounds for Mr. Cannon's request to dispense with service are, in my view, unsubstantiated and do not satisfy me that these 41 respondents should not be served as required under *The Queen's Bench Rules*. The application to dispense with service is dismissed.
 - [4] Mr. Cannon has brought his application for *habeas corpus* purportedly on behalf of four other persons: Dale Richardson, Kaysha Dery, Karis Richardson and Christy Dawn Pembrum.
 - [5] Mr. Cannon has alleged no deprivation of liberty on his own behalf. Dale Richardson was held under a mental health warrant and has been released. He is present in court today. Kaysha Dery was detained for her alleged refusal to comply with COVID-19 isolation requirements and has since been released. She is present in court today. Karis Richardson, a child under two years of age, is at the centre of a family law dispute. I am uncertain as to who Christy Dawn Pembrun is, and the materials are inadequate in addressing any concerns in her regard.
 - [6] On reviewing the materials submitted and addressing the issues of concern with the parties, I am dismissing the application for *habeas corpus* for the following reasons:
 - (a) the <u>originating application was not properly served on all the 41 respondents</u> in compliance with *The Queen's Bench Rules*. This is contrary to previous orders of the Court.
 - (b) Mr. Cannon is the applicant however he has not been deprived of liberty. Instead, he sets out a number of allegations which relate not to himself but, rather, to a variety of grievances held primarily by Mr. Richardson and Ms. Dery.
 - (c) Mr. Cannon is not a lawyer and relies on his "Christian duty" in bringing this application; however, the application seeks substantial financial remuneration payable to the corporation he represents, starting "a \$2,000,000 cash non-refundable retainer". I would caution Mr. Cannon

that he may want to review *The Legal Profession Act*, 1990, SS 1990-91, c L-10.1, and the restrictions on acting on behalf of another party, particularly where remuneration is sought.

- (e) The relief that is sought is far beyond the scope of *habeas corpus*. It incorporates a number of third-party grievances against a vast range of respondents for a broad array of allegations. The issues and parties do not establish the criteria for a *habeas corpus* application have been met.
- (f) The application for *habeas corpus* is moot. There is no deprivation of the applicant's liberty that would trigger *habeas corpus*.
- (g) Although not named applicants in the matter, the evidence does not establish that any of the four individuals Mr. Cannon purports to speak for have had an unlawful deprivation of their liberty or that any past deprivation was without legitimate grounds. None of these individuals remain in custody, nor am I satisfied any are currently detained as alleged by Mr. Cannon.
- (h) Lam not satisfied there is a live issue and decline to exercise my discretion to determine the application as I view it as theoretical.
- [7] Habeas corpus does not lie in the circumstances. The application is dismissed.
- [8] I am ordering costs payable by the applicant in the amount of \$500.00. This amount shall be paid into court within 30 days. There are four counsel who appeared at today's hearing and this amount shall be divided equally among the four counsel on behalf of those respondents. If there are any issues with division of the costs, that sole issue may be returned to me for further direction.
- 14. In the hearing on September 10, 2020 in the COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH FOR SASKATCHEWAN, JUSTICE N.D. CROOKS also purported that the *Detainee* was taken under a *lawful order* of the Court by JUSTICE R.W. ELSON and thereby that the *Detainee* was not in "custody" and that the *Appellant*.must has a different understanding of "custody" or "detainment". The *Appellant* would like to direct attention to JUSTICE R.W. ELSON's order for "interim custody" where he ordered that the *Detainee* be put into the "custody" of her mother KIMBERLEY A. RICHARDSON ("KIM"). The *Appellant* duly sought "to have the validity of the detention determined by way of *habeas corpus* and to be released if the detention is not lawful" which is the *Detainee*'s constitutional right; however, such right was struck down on the first and *final* hearing with the foregoing orders.
- 15. The Appellant would like to direct attention to the COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH FOR SASKATCHEWAN and JUSTICE R.W. ELSON being Respondents, as the Appellant was purporting that the order to detain the Detainee was unlawful and subject to review under the Privilege of Writ of Habeas Corpus (see Appendix A on page 1a); this behaviour from JUSTICE N.D. CROOKS is expected as

- she was reviewing the decision of a fellow judge in COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH FOR SASKATCHEWAN and having the Court review its own decision.
- 16. JUSTICE N.D. CROOKS also purported that "Karis Richardson, a child under two years of age, is at the centre of a family law dispute"; however, DALE could not appeal JUSTICE R.W. ELSON's orders by way of judicial review as he was strapped to a bed and consistently drugged against his will in the BATTLEFORDS MENTAL HEALTH CENTRE and recovering from the same during the appeal period; given the circumstances, the *Appellant* submitted an application for *Writ of Habeas Corpus* for the *Detainee* on August 26, 2020 as he concluded that *habeas corpus lie in the circumstances*. After DALE's recovery, he filed an extension for time and was subsequently denied by JUSTICE J.A. CALDWELL of this Court on October 28, 2020.
- 17. To preserve justice and avoid the *prejudice of self-reporting*, JUSTICE N.D. CROOKS's should have disclosed her *prejudice* and immediately referred the case to this Court; instead, she made *final* orders to suspend the *Privilege of Writ of Habeas Corpus* for the *Detainee* on the basis that she did not "remain in custody" as she was under a *lawful order* of the Court and that "the evidence does not establish" that "any past deprivation was without legitimate grounds" despite evidence of that JUSTICE R.W. ELSON's orders were unlawful and explicit text message evidence of her abduction by KIMBERLEY A. RICHARDSON on June 1, 2020 prior to such orders as follows:

Kimberly

Mon, Jun 1, 12:22 PM

Dale, I've spoken to my lawyer this morning and have been advised to let you know that at this time you will not be given access to Karis.

This is also to advise you that you are no longer permitted on my parents property and we've been advised to contact the RCMP if you come on their land.

(see Appendix B on page 20a)

18. This Court violated sections 9 and 10 of the Charter in its decision to refuse ex parte for the application for Writ of Habeas Corpus to correct the self-evident extreme prejudice and Charter violations of the Court of Queen's Bench for Saskatchewan in dismissing the Privilege of Writ of Habeas Corpus; even worse, this Court decided to hear the appeal nearly five months after the First Motion in which the foregoing evidence was provided and the order barring ex parte was issued; thereby, this Court is responsible for continuing the violations to the Charter made by the Court of Queen's Bench for Saskatchewan and is unqualified to handle the application for Writ of Habeas Corpus as this Court shall also be subjected to judicial review in a higher court (see Appendix C on page 24a).

- C. The Application for Writ of Habeas Corpus is of National and International Importance
- 19. The suspension of *Privilege of Writ of Habeas Corpus* anywhere in CANADA's jurisdiction is a matter of national importance as such privilege is the basis of the constitution, especially when such suspension relates to covering up the mismanagement of the Covid emergency which is a matter of interest to both national and international importance.
- 20. Constitutional questions have arisen from the application for Writ of Habeas Corpus which only the SUPREME COURT OF CANADA is able to answer as the same pertain to federal statutes and the application of the UN Torture Convention with respect the corporation as a distinct natural person and the corporate shield, specifically the SASKATCHEWAN HEALTH AUTHORITY, a not-for-profit corporation, being used to shield its employees from being officials and liability under the UN Torture Convention (see Appendix D on page 29a).
- 21. The application for *Writ of Habeas Corpus* also relates to an application to the International Criminal Court to investigate *genocide*, *crimes against humanity*, and *crimes of aggression* which is of interested to the international community as a whole (see Appendix E on page 39a).
- 22. Given the grave nature of the foregoing, this *Motion for Leave* is also made pursuant to section 40 of the *Supreme Court Act*, namely:
 - 40 (1) Subject to subsection (3), an appeal lies to the Supreme Court from any final or other judgment of the Federal Court of Appeal or of the highest court of final resort in a province, or a judge thereof, in which judgment can be had in the particular case sought to be appealed to the Supreme Court, whether or not leave to appeal to the Supreme Court has been refused by any other court, where, with respect to the particular case sought to be appealed, the Supreme Court is of the opinion that any question involved therein is, by reason of its public importance or the importance of any issue of law or any issue of mixed law and fact involved in that question, one that ought to be decided by the Supreme Court or is, for any other reason, of such a nature or significance as to warrant decision by it, and leave to appeal from that judgment is accordingly granted by the Supreme Court.
 - (2) An application for leave to appeal under this section shall be brought in accordance with paragraph 58(1)(a).
 - (3) No appeal to the Court lies under this section from the judgment of any court acquitting or convicting or setting aside or affirming a conviction or acquittal of an indictable offence or, except in respect of a question of law or jurisdiction, of an offence other than an indictable offence.
 - (4) Whenever the Court has granted leave to appeal, the Court or a judge may, notwithstanding anything in this Act, extend the time within which the appeal may be allowed.

III. CONCLUSION

- 23. Without Privilege of Writ of Habeas Corpus to prevent ruling authorities or usurpers and despots from arbitrarily detaining and torturing persons regardless of laws and treaties, the Charter is simply an illusion. The Privilege of Writ of Habeas Corpus is the only mechanism to ensure that laws and treaties are upheld for all persons.
- 24. The *Privilege of Writ of Habeas Corpus* is a CHRISTIAN right that guards the Life and Liberty of all people inside and outside of the CANADA. Any person or persons who attempts to suspend or worse abolish this CHRISTIAN right are ANTI-CHRISTIAN and seek to abolish true CHRISTIANITY. The *Appellant* would like to direct attention the preamble the the *Charter*. "Whereas Canada is founded upon principles that recognize the supremacy of God and the rule of law".
- 25. This Motion for Leave is made for (1) leave to appeal JUSTICE J.A. SCHWANN's first and final decision, in part, to the SUPREME COURT OF CANADA pursuant to sections 37 and 60 of the Supreme Court Act, specifically her decision to dismiss hearing the matter ex parte for the Detainee, (2) an extension of time for appeal pursuant to section 59(1) of the same, and (3) waiving compliance with the rules of this Court for the foregoing pursuant to subsection 4(1) of the rules of this Court; such motion is made to uphold the "supremacy of God and the rule of law".

ALL OF WHICH is respectfully submitted,

January 29, 2021

ROBERT A. CANNON 1102 Ave L North,

Saskatoon, SK CA S7L 2S1

Tel:

1 306 480-9473

Pratect Commen

Email:

robert.cannon@usask.ca

ROBERT A. CANNON

TO: COURT OF APPEAL FOR SASKATCHEWAN

2425 Victoria Avenue

Tel:

1 306 787-5382

Regina, SK, S4P 4W6, Canada

Email:

CARegistrar@sasklawcourts.ca

AND TO: CLERK OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL

Privy Council Office

Tel: Fax: 1 613 957-5153

85 Sparks Street, Room 1000

t. Room 1000

1 613 957-5043

Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0A3

Email:

info@pco-bcp.gc.ca

AND TO: QUEEN'S PRIVY COUNCIL FOR CANADA

Forwarded by the Clerk of the Privy Council as complaints about justices and judges herein.

APPENDICES

EX PARTE MOTION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL TO THE SUPREME COURT FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

IN THE
COURT OF APPEAL FOR SASKATCHEWAN
CASE No. CACV3708
JANUARY 29, 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appendix A	
Evidence that Justice R.W. Elson's Orders were Fraudulent	1a
Appendix B	
Kidnapping of Dale's infant daughter Karis by wife Kim endorsed by Justice R.W. Elson	20a
Appendix C	
Does the Court of Appeal for Saskatchewan value the Constitution?	24a
Appendix D	
Notice of Constitutional Questions Arising from the Application	29a
Appendix E	
Suspension of Writ of Habeas Corpus by the Supreme Court of the United States	39a
Application to the International Criminal Court which Relates to this Motion for Leave58a	-727a

Appendix E

Suspension of Writ of Habeas Corpus by the Supreme Court of the United States

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICE OF THE CLERK WASHINGTON, DC 20543-0001

December 31, 2020

Robert A. Cannon 1102 Ave L North Saskatoon, SK S7L 2S1 CANADA, XX

RE: In Re Dery

Dear Mr. Cannon:

The application was titled: "Ex Parte & Pro Se Original Application for Writ of Habeas Corpus", not extraordinary writ.

The above-entitled petition for an extraordinary writ of habeas corpus was received on December 30, 2020. The papers are returned for the following reason(s):

No motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis, signed by the petitioner or by counsel, is attached. Rules 33.2(a) and 39. A cheque for \$300 USD, the filing fee, was provided No notarized affidavit or declaration of indigency is attached. Rule 39. You may use and returned. the enclosed form.

The petition does not show how the writ will be in aid of the Court's appellate jurisdiction, what exceptional circumstances warrant the exercise of the Court's discretionary powers, and why adequate relief cannot be obtained in any other form or from any other court. Rule 20.1. Rule 20 was never purported as grounds for the application, An attorney seeking to file a document in this Court in a representative capacity must only Rule 22 and

An attorney seeking to file a document in this Court in a representative capacity must only Rule 22 and first be admitted to practice before this Court as provided in Rule 5, except that admission to the Bar of this Court is not required for an attorney appointed under the Criminal Justice Act of 1964. Rule 9.1.

The petition does not follow the form prescribed by Rule 14 as required by Rule 20.2. An application for Writ of Habeas Corpus does not require a lawyer pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2243 which uses the terminology of the "applicant or the person detained" distinguishing them as different, this is the nature of the Writ.

Does this letter constitute treason?
Or something more sinister, the invariable pursuit of the Object?

40a A copy of the corrected petition must be served on opposing counsel. A Writ of Habeas Corpus can be issued *ex parte*, a Clerk should know this. Sincerely, Scott S. Harris, Clerk Clara Houghteling (202) 479-5955 Enclosures

No.

In The Supreme Court of the United States

ROBERT A. CANNON

Pro Se Applicant,

On behalf of KAYSHA F.N. DERY

Detainee,

v.

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES;
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY;
U.S. CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES;
U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT;
SCOTT ROBINSON, ZCH 193;
NEVADA SOUTHERN DETENTION CENTER;
and BRIAN KOEHN.

Respondents.

Affidavit of Attempted Delivery For Ex Parte & Pro Se Original Application for Writ of Habeas Corpus

To the HONORABLE AMY CONEY BARRETT, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States and Acting Circuit Justice for the Seventh Circuit

RECEIVED SUPREME COURT U.S. POLICE OFFICE

2020 DEC 28 PM 12: 15

ROBERT A. CANNON 1102 Ave L North,

Saskatoon, SK CA S7L 2S1 Tel: 306 480-9473

Email: robert.cannon@usask.ca

MB/410

RECEIVED
DEC 3 1 2020
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

AFFIDAVIT OF ATTEMPTED DELIVERY FOR EX PARTE & PRO SE ORIGINAL APPLICATION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

- I, Robert CANNON, of the City of Saskatoon, in the Province of Saskatchewan, in the Country of Canada, a citizen of the United States of America living abroad, affirm to the best of my knowledge and say as follows:
 - On the 28th day of December, 2020 at approximately 10:05 A.M. EST, I
 attempted to deliver copies of the following documents to the ATTORNEY
 GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, currently JEFFREY A. ROSEN, a respondent,
 or his duly authorized representative at 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW,
 Washington, DC 20530:

EX PARTE & PRO SE ORIGINAL APPLICATION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES DECEMBER 24, 2020

APPENDICES EX PARTE & PRO SE ORIGINAL APPLICATION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES DECEMBER $24,\,2020$

- I was hindered by two officers at the visitor entrance which referred me to the mail room phone number; the representative thereof alleged that delivery could only be effected by mail due to the Covid emergency.
- On the 28th day of December, 2020 at approximately 10:31 A.M. EST, I
 mailed the foregoing documents to the ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE US at 950
 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20530 from the BENJAMIN
 FRANKLIN, DC POST OFFICE at 1200 Pennsylvania Ave NW Washington, DC
 20004.
- 4. I am unsure as to whether such domestic mail will also be suspended.

- 5. To attempt delivery, I travelled at least 2457 miles.
- 6. I stand as the 2ND WITNESS to certain events specified in the application which are terrorism and treason against the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. I do not fear death or persecution as I fear GOD and not man. If GOD allows me to be persecuted, I trust him and that he knows what is best for humanity and for me. I do this not for or of myself, GOD has used me to do this for Christian Rights And Freedoms and for the American People.

Robert Cannon

Subscribed and affirmed before me at the City of Washington, in the District of Columbia, in the Country of United States of America, this 28th day of December,

2020.

Notary Public

District of Columbia: SS

Subscribed and Sworn to before me

this 28 day of December, 2020

Notary Public, D.C.

My commission expires 5-14-2023

ROBERT A. CANNON 1102 Ave L North, Saskatoon, SK CA S7L 2S1

December 24th, 2020

HONORABLE AMY CONEY BARRETT Associate Justice of the Seventh Circuit Supreme Court of the United States One First Street N.E. Washington, D.C. 20543

To the HONORABLE AMY CONEY BARRETT,

I, ROBERT A. CANNON, a UNITED STATES citizen living abroad in CANADA, have discovered a MASONIC conspiracy to overthrow the people of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. RELIGIOUS FREEDOM is at stake, as both CHRISTIANS, CATHOLICS, and other religions are suffering severe infringements of their RELIGIOUS LIBERTY in CANADA, the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA and countries around the world arising from the mismanagement of the Covid emergency.

After Dale J.S. Richardson ("Dale") and his daughter Kaysha F.N. Dery ("Kaysha"), officers of the Canadian federal corporation DSR Karls Consulting Inc. and of the Delaware corporation DSR Karls North Consulting Inc., suffered severe religious persecution for performing their Christian Duty and for whistle-blowing the mismanagement of the Covid emergency in Saskatchewan, Kaysha fled to the United States of America for safety, but was persecuted by Masonic conspirators to the mismanagement of the Covid emergency, some operating under the jurisdiction of the State of Illinois.

Despite the fact that these MASONIC conspirators are arbitrarily, unconstitutionally, and unlawfully detaining KAYSHA and torturing her, KAYSHA is more scared of CANADA as she was detained, isolated, and tortured in a maximum security prison for the criminally insane without cause and her father DALE was strapped to a bed and drugged against his will for his CHRISTIAN BELIEFS and for agreeing with certain elements of the political opinion of the JESUIT affiliated CARLO MARIA VIGANÒ, Titular Archbishop of Ulpiana, about how the mismanagement of the Covid emergency is being used to build a world without freedom through the dissolution of social order: Solve et Coagula as the MASONIC adage teaches.

The previous 40 copies of the Ex Parte & Pro Se Petition for Extraordinary Writ that I delivered on behalf of Wisework Consulting Corp. on behalf of DSR Karis North Consulting Inc. directed to the Honorable Amy Coney Barrett have not been returned, nor has the three hundred U.S. dollar cashier cheque despite Clara Houghteling on behalf of Clerk Scott S. Harris of the Supreme Court of the United States purporting that such petition would not be accepted and had been returned with the cheque.

Attached to this transmittal are the following enclosures:

- (1) a original application for writ of habeas corpus with me as the applicant on behalf of KAYSHA;
 - (2) 40 copies of the foregoing application;

Present Cann

- (3) the appendices for the foregoing application; and
- (4) a cheque for the three hundred U.S. dollar filing fee for the foregoing application.

I will be in route shortly to deliver the application in addition to delivery by mail as there has been substantial judicial interference and suspension of mail in CANADA and the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA which has hindered DALE, KAYSHA, and I from carrying out our CHRISTIAN DUTY.

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. CANNON

No. _____

In The Supreme Court of the United States

ROBERT A. CANNON

Pro Se Applicant,

On behalf of KAYSHA F.N. DERY

Detainee,

V

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES;
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY;
U.S. CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES;
U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT;
SCOTT ROBINSON, ZCH 193;
NEVADA SOUTHERN DETENTION CENTER;
and BRIAN KOEHN.

Respondents.

Ex Parte & Pro Se Original Application for Writ of Habeas Corpus

To the Honorable Amy Coney Barrett, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States and Acting Circuit Justice for the Seventh Circuit

SUPREME COURT U.S. POLICE OFFICE

2020 DEC 28 AM 9: 07

ROBERT A. CANNON 1102 Ave L North, Saskatoon, SK CA S7L 2S1

Tel: 306 480-9473

Email: robert.cannon@usask.ca

MB/410

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- 1. Who are the people of the United States of America? Is it the posterity of the United States of America? Is it all persons born or naturalized in the United States of America and their posterity? Is it Indians born within the territorial limits of the United States of America and their posterity? Or is it all of the above?
- 2. What is an Indian? Is it the indigenous peoples? Is it posterity of the indigenous peoples? Is it the MÉTIS? Or is it all of the above? Or is it the interpretation of 50% blood quantum under the Immigration and Nationality Act? Does the United States of America have the right define the same?
- 3. Do the MÉTIS and their posterity, being taxed or taxable INDIANS, which were deported to CANADA, have the right to be counted as part of the whole number of persons in each State for the purpose of appointing representatives for the electors for President and Vice-President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the Executive and Judicial officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof?
- 4. Is evicting and/or banning a person or persons from the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA when such person or persons has a right to be on AMERICAN soil or attempting to do the same a restriction of their liberty and a form of illegal confinement and thereby qualify them for a Writ of Habeas Corpus? What Court would have jurisdiction of such writ?

i

- 5. Is the right to an investigation under a Writ of Habeas Corpus suspended if the Detainee dies during or as a result of a restriction of liberty or illegal confinement—especially when the subject matter affects the rights and freedoms of the people of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA?
- 6. What is a person under the constitution? Is it a human being or human corpus? Is it an INDIAN? Are the people of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA persons? Is an alien a person—especially when they have the right to abide on AMERICAN soil? Or is it all of the above?
- 7. Is it constitutional to detain a person under any law that is not criminal law?
- 8. Is it constitutional for a person or persons to be deprived of life, liberty, or property by Immigration Court when the same is not part of the United States of America judicial branch responsible for the due process of law, but instead is an administrative body which is a part of the Department of Justice headed by the Attorney General of the United States?
- 9. Can an administrative body be found guilty of conspiracy to commit murder when a duly authorized representative of such body acting under the colour of authority of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA in such body evicted and/or banned a person or persons to a foreign jurisdiction having purportedly reviewed evidence in their official capacity that demonstrated such jurisdiction was unsafe, and does such representative have judicial immunity from conspiracy to commit murder through such body?

- 10. Is a Court that suspended a Writ of Habeas Corpus for any reason and by any means not permitted by the United States Constitution a competent authority for conducting an investigation under such writ—especially when the subject matter includes claims of torture under the United Nations Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment binding the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA?
- 11. Given the common law nature of the Privilege of Writ of Habeas Corpus, does a corrupt court constitute a suspension of the Privilege of Writ of Habeas Corpus for person or persons held within its jurisdiction?
- 12. Is suspending the Privilege of Writ of Habeas Corpus for any reason and by any means not permitted by the United States Constitution an act of treason?

SUSPENSION OF PRIVILEGE OF WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

The United States District Court for the District of Nevada located at 333 Las Vegas Blvd. South Las Vegas, NV 89101 received by mail an *Ex Parte Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus* submitted by the *Pro Se Applicant* on behalf of the *Detainee*. Such petition was filed on Tuesday, December 8, 2020 as a civil case with the case number of 2:20–cv–02218–JAD–DJA and was misinterpreted as *pro se* legal representation and was suspended in violation of 28 U.S. Code § 2243 under the guise of the following: "Due to this court's extremely heavy case load this review process may take several weeks." Such suspension in cooperation with the *Detainee*'s subsequent deportation would allegedly render the *Writ of Habeas*

Corpus moot, but the same is currently in question; mens rea has yet to be proven in such case, however, actus reus is clear, as it would yet again hinder an official investigation into the events surrounding the mismanagement of the Covid emergency relating to the Detainee's arbitrary, unconstitutional, and unlawful detainments in both Canada and the United States of America.

PRIVILEGE OF WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

The Privilege of Writ of Habeas Corpus is guaranteed by the United States

Constitution except in the case of Rebellion or Invasion for the prevention or speedy relief of a person or persons seized or imprisoned without due process of law. Such privilege guarantees that "You shall have the body" and when an Application for a Writ of Habeas Corpus is submitted to a court, justice, or judge on your behalf, the same shall forthwith direct the Writ to any person who has seized or imprisoned you, such person must bring or cause your body to be brought before the same within three days, unless distance requires additional time, for an investigation into the lawfulness of your seizure or imprisonment. Before slavery was abolished by the 13th Amendment except for parties duly convicted for crime, the Privilege of Writ of Habeas Corpus was often applied to alleged slaves claiming freedom held by private parties. The Privilege of Writ of Habeas Corpus is a CHRISTIAN right that guards the Life and Liberty of all people inside and outside of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. Any person or persons who attempts to suspend or worse abolish this CHRISTIAN right are ANTI-CHRISTIAN and seek to abolish true CHRISTIANITY.

PARTIES

This petition stems from an Ex Parte Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus proceeding in which the Detainee is the Petitioner before the UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA. The Detainee is a federal prisoner awaiting deportation and in the physical custody of the Respondent BRIAN KOEHN, warden of NEVADA SOUTHERN DETENTION CENTER in Pahrump, Nevada which is contracted by U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY to detain alleged aliens such as the Detainee. Respondents Scott Robinson, ZCH 193 from the Chicago ASYLUM OFFICE in the STATE OF ILLINOIS or his supposed successor COLLAZO is a custodial official acting within the boundaries of the judicial district of the UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA. The Respondent SCOTT ROBINSON, ZCH 193 is an asylum officer under the authority of U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT, which is under the authority of U.S. CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES, which is under the authority of U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, which is under the authority of the ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES. The Detainee is under the direct control of the Respondents and their agents.

JURISDICTION

This Court has jurisdiction for this Ex Parte & Pro Se Original Application for Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2241 and 2242 which is the second petition for the *Detainee* which has not been sentenced by any court. This application proposes constitutional questions that only this Court can answer as

some relate to treaties, federal treason, and the constitutionality of IMMIGRATION COURT as a whole. This is the only Court that has both the authority to answer these questions and has jurisdiction over federal prisoners being held in the STATE OF NEVADA pursuant to the authority of those operating out of the STATE OF ILLINOIS; there is no better Court to handle this application which challenges the decision of the UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA to suspend the *Privilege of Writ of Habeas Corpus* of the *Detainee*. The UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA is not a *competent authority* to assess its own decision to suspend the *Privilege of Writ of Habeas Corpus*, nor is the UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT a *competent authority* to answer the constitutional questions purported in this application.

PRO SE LEGAL REPRESENTATION

The Privilege of Writ of Habeas Corpus is a common-law writ guaranteed by the United States Constitution as no Rebellion or Invasion was claimed as the reason for the suspension of such Writ. Any person may apply for such Writ on behalf of any person that has been deprived of liberty. The Writ of Habeas Corpus stems from British common law and the Habeas Corpus Act 1679 which reads "For the prevention whereof and the more speedy Releife of all persons imprisoned for any such criminall or supposed criminall Matters whensoever any person or persons shall bring any Habeas Corpus directed unto any Sheriffe or Sheriffes Goaler Minister or other Person whatsoever for any person in his or their Custody".

TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED
SUSPENSION OF PRIVILEGE OF WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUSii
PRIVILEGE OF WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUSiv
PARTIES
JURISDICTION
PRO SE LEGAL REPRESENTATIONv
TO THE HONORABLE AMY CONEY BARRETT, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES AND ACTING CIRCUIT JUSTICE
FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT:
STATEMENT OF THE CASE
A. Engineering Reimagined
B. Criminal Negligence
C. The July 23rd Terrorist Attacks
D. Habeas Corpus Ad Subjiciendum
E. A Métis Plea for Safety and Asylum
F. Another Habeas Corpus Ad Subjiciendum
G. Extreme Prejudice16
H The Extraordinary Condition

54a
I. The Supreme Court of the United States21 REASONS FOR GRANTING THE APPLICATION22
viii

TO THE HONORABLE AMY CONEY BARRETT, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES AND ACTING CIRCUIT JUSTICE FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT:

Pursuant to Rule 22 of the Rules of this Court and 28 U.S.C. § 2241 and 2242, the *Pro Se Applicant* Robert A. Cannon, a United States citizen living abroad in Canada, respectfully requests a *Writ of Habeas Corpus* on behalf of the *Detainee* Kaysha F.N. Dery be issued and directed to the *Respondents* to overrule the suspension of the *Privilege of Writ of Habeas Corpus* as part of a Masonic conspiracy to cover up the mismanagement of the Covid emergency which is an act of treason against the United States of America and 28 U.S.C. § 2243 both authorizes and compels the issuance of such writ.

CATHOLICS and CHRISTIANS have had their rights and freedoms, specifically the *Privilege of Writ of Habeas Corpus*, the free exercise of Religion, and the unalienable rights to Life, Liberty, and pursuit of Happiness, taken by the Masonic conspirators through the mismanagement of the Covid emergency, as predicted by the Jesuit affiliated Carlo Maria Viganò, Titular Archbishop of Ulpiana, when he alleged that such mismanagement has furthered the dissolution of the social order so as to build a world without freedom: *Solve et Coagula*, as the Masonic adage teaches. The supposed presidential elect Joseph R. Biden, has advocated further measures to be enforced in the name of the Covid emergency and the United States District Court for the District of Nevada has endorsed his claim by suppressing evidence of its mismanagement.



