

OPEN LETTER TO ONTARIO JUSTICE OF PEACE REVIEW COUNCIL

OPEN LETTER TO ONTARIO JUDICIAL COUNCIL

FEBRUARY 9, 2018 **S3, S9.1, 15, 16 STATUTORY POWERS PROCEDURE ACT**
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION AND REVERSAL OF ALL BELOW MENTIONED
DECISIONS OR FACE CRIMINAL PROSEUTION FOR ALL CRIMES BELOW

By Applicant, Ade Olumide, Tel: 613 265 6360 Fax: 613 832 2051, ade6035@gmail.com

To Chair, Justices Of The Peace Review Council, P. O. Box 914, Adelaide Street Postal Station, 31 Adelaide Street East, Toronto, Ontario, M5C 2K3 416-327-2339 (Fax)

TO: Chair, Ontario Judicial Council, P. O. Box 914, Adelaide Street Postal Station, 31 Adelaide Street East, Toronto, Ontario, M5C 2K3 416-327-2339 (Fax)

ONTARIO JUSTICE OF PEACE REVIEW COUNCIL

Breached s380(1) Criminal Code;

Council cannot state in writing that **any JP has jurisdiction to refuse to comply with;**

- a) Rule of law that a criminal should not be permitted to keep the proceeds of his crime; “Garland v. Consumers’ Gas Co., [2004] 1 S.C.R. 629, 2004 SCC 25, 52...Criminal Code are intra vires the level of government that enacted them...overriding public policy consideration in this case is.. As a matter of public policy, **a criminal should not be permitted to keep the proceeds of his crime.**” is part of the Constitution, which was codified in s16 Victims Bill of Rights to restitution duty of Council to reverse disposition of all complaints OR face criminal prosecution to enforce s16.
- b) Fraud 380 (1) Every one who, by deceit, falsehood or other fraudulent means, whether or not it is a false pretence within the meaning of this Act, defrauds the public or any person, whether ascertained or not, of any property, money or valuable security or **any service,**
- c) RWDSU v. Dolphin Delivery Ltd., [1986] 2 SCR 573, 1986 CanLII 5 (SCC) The Charter will apply to any rule of the common law that ...directs an abridgement of a guaranteed right...**if an...order would infringe a Charter right, the Charter will apply to preclude the order,** and, by necessary implication, to modify the common law rule...**The courts are, of course, bound by the Charter;**
- d) Enforcement of guaranteed rights and freedoms. 24. (1) **Anyone** whose rights or freedoms, as guaranteed by this Charter, have been infringed or denied **may apply to a court** of competent jurisdiction to obtain such remedy as the court considers appropriate and just in the circumstances.
- e) front page of Ontario Court of Justice s504 s507.1 information form “As a citizen, you have the right to appear before a Justice of the Peace to lay charges against another person by swearing to an Information. A Justice of Peace must receive the Information if it meets the statutory provisions of the Criminal Code of Canada.”

- f) Constitution Acts 1867 to 1982 ... Parliament of Canada 91 ‘Criminal Law... including the Procedure in Criminal Matters’ “jurisdiction over s2 "prosecutorwhere the Attorney General does not intervene, ..person who institutes proceedings to which this Act applies", s482(1)“rules of court not inconsistent with this or any other Act of Parliament, ... within the jurisdiction of that court,” s482(3) “Purpose of rules ... to attain the ends of justice”, s504 "justice shall receive the information", s507.1 “shall ... heard and considered .. informant...witnesses”, 683(2).. Parties entitled to adduce evidence and be heard, 802(1) “prosecutor is entitled personally to conduct his case..”, 507.1(2)(3)(8) “cause the evidence to be taken in accordance with section 540 in so far as that section is capable of being applied” s551.2 “ensuring that the evidence on the merits is presented without interruption”, s551.3(1g Charter),
- g) Superior Court Justice Hackland who initiated more crimes than any other judge, denied the s504 s507.1 injunction by the Crown for lack of jurisdiction, the Ontario Court of Justice do not agree, so they are arresting, assaulting, abusing, threatening injury, extorting, intimidating, discriminating, mocking, belittling, demeaning, lying about jurisdiction, lying about meaning of s504 “person” “justice system participant” “organization” in order to facilitate multiple ongoing crimes.
- h) *Olumide v Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Ontario*, 2017 ONSC “[9] The current case law holds that a **Justice of the Peace cannot decline to accept an information**. Justice Code in *Waskowec v. Ontario*, 2014 ONSC 1646 (CanLII) held that the powers of a Justice of the Peace under s. 504 of the Criminal Code are purely ministerial with no place for judicial discretion; at para 11:”
- i) *Olumide v Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Ontario*, 2017 ONSC 1201 [13] .. an **entitlement granted by the Criminal Code cannot be constrained by a court order** granted under provincial legislation ...
- j) *Olumide v Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Ontario*, 2017 ONSC [19] ...the **injunctive relief requested is beyond the Court’s jurisdiction** in that it would restrict the right of a private citizen to lay an information under section 504 of the Criminal Code and thus is arguably not permissible.
- k) *R. v. Zlatic*, [1993] 2 SCR 29, 1993 CanLII 135 (SCC) (i) Fraud by "Other Fraudulent Means" ... Most frauds continue to involve either deceit or falsehood. As is pointed out in *Théroux*, proof of deceit or falsehood is sufficient to establish the *actus reus* of fraud; no further proof of dishonest action is needed. However, the third category of "other fraudulent means" has been used to support convictions in a number of situations where deceit or falsehood cannot be shown. These situations include, to date, the use of corporate funds for personal purposes, **non-disclosure of important facts**, exploiting the weakness of another, Dishonesty is, of course, difficult to define with precision. It does, however, connote an **underhanded design** which has the effect, or which engenders the risk, of depriving others of what is theirs. J. D. Ewart, in his *Criminal Fraud* (1986), defines dishonest conduct as that "which ordinary, decent people would feel was **discreditable** as being clearly **at variance with straightforward or honourable dealings**" (p. 99). The dishonesty of "other fraudulent means" has, at its heart, the wrongful use of something in which another person has an interest, in such a manner that this other's interest is extinguished or put at risk. A use is "wrongful" in this context if it constitutes conduct which reasonable decent persons would consider dishonest and **unscrupulous**.... The authorities make it clear that it is **unnecessary for a defrauding party to**

profit from his or her fraud in order to be convicted; it is equally **unnecessary that the victims of a fraud suffer actual pecuniary loss** in order that the offence be made out;

- l) *Roncarelli v. Duplessis* 1959 CanLII 50 (SCC), [1959] S.C.R. 121, ...**there is no such thing as absolute and untrammelled "discretion"**, that is that action can be taken on **any ground or for any reason** ...; no legislative Act can... be taken to contemplate an unlimited arbitrary power exercisable for any purpose, however capricious or irrelevant, regardless of the nature or purpose of the statute. ... "Discretion" necessarily implies good faith in discharging public duty; ... **any clear departure from its lines or objects is just as objectionable as fraud or corruption.**

- a) *Freeman v. Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2013-10-23, 2013 FC 1065, IMM-6304-12, "good faith" means "... **carrying out the statute according to its intent and for its purpose**; ... not with an **improper intent** ... "good faith" does not mean ... **punishing a person for exercising an unchallengeable right**" and "**it does not mean arbitrarily and illegally attempting to divest a citizen of an incident of his civil status**"... "**acts that are so ... inconsistent with ... legislative context that a court cannot ...conclude that they were performed in good faith**". ... evidence of bad faith is not required. It can... be inferred from the **surrounding circumstances**.... that **absence of good faith can be deduced and bad faith presumed**":

- b) *Canadian Broadcasting Corporation v The Queen*, 1983 CanLII 50 (SCC), [1983] 1 S.C.R. 339 the Supreme Court upheld the decision of the Ontario Court of Appeal that CBC could be prosecuted under Criminal Code, "it is not enough ..that the purpose ... is an authorized purpose; **the Court must also determine that the means which the agent uses to accomplish the purpose are expressly or impliedly**" ... **I am quite satisfied that it never entered the mind of Parliament that C.B.C. could not be reached by the statute...** *R. v. Eldorado Nuclear Ltd.; R. v. Uranium Canada Ltd.*, [1983] 2 SCR 551 "I have serious **doubts that Parliament ever intended...carte blanche to engage in illegal activities on behalf of the Crown and to encourage other citizens to do likewise**" "We might ask in this case whether Parliament ever contemplated that the respondents would go about the implementation of their statutory purposes by means of an illegal conspiracy with others, counting on the protection of their Crown immunity"

Breached s341 Criminal Code; Lack of "warn" or "reprimand" or "education" or "removal" jurisdiction over 11.2(2b) "(ii) conduct that is incompatible with the due execution of his or her office, (prohibited criminal offences that bring the administration of justice into disrepute) (iii) failure to perform the duties of his or her office" re JPs **McAleer, Hiscox, St Jean, Ralph, Drescher, Kreling** arrest and assault of a victim of crime in order to extort victim's Criminal Code s2"prosecutor" s482 s504 s507.1 s540 s551.2 s551.3(1g Charter) s683(2) s788 s802 / Canada Victims Bill of Rights s2 objects, 6, 9, 10, 16 / Charter of Rights s9, s10, s12 s15 / s1(a,b,e), s2(a,b,c,e) Canada Bill of Rights against criminal revictimization of victim with mens rae to retain proceeds ^{Garland} of crime principle of fundamental justice / Canada Interpretation Act s11 s12 s13 s21 s34 / Ontario Interpretation Act s10 / Justice of Peace Act s3 oath, s17(3) duty to assist / rule of law against using public power to deliberately commit criminal offences, is a fraudulent misrepresentation.

Breached s81b Police Services Act; s21b party to offence, s22 person counselling, s22.2 organization party to offence, s25.1(9)(11b) public officer offence, s122 breach of trust use of public power against the public good in order to obtain personal benefit, s139(1)(2)(3a) obstruction of justice, s140(1b)

inducing police to commit a crime by lying that a black male is a security risk, s265(1a,b)(3c,d) assault, s346(1.1b) extortion, s380(1a) fraud, s341 fraudulent concealment, s423.1(b) intimidation.

Breached 482(1) criminal code by dishonestly/ partiality acting without jurisdiction to defraud criminal code “482(1) ... may make rules of court not inconsistent with this or any other Act of Parliament, and any rules so made apply to any prosecution, proceeding, action or appeal ,... in relation to any matter of a criminal nature or arising from or incidental to any such prosecution, proceeding, action or appeal”

Breached s3 s17(3) Justice Peace Act by dishonestly and with partiality acting without jurisdiction to defraud “service” “property” Justice of Peace Act “3. . I will faithfully and to the best of my skill and knowledge, execute the duties of a justice of the peace, and I will do so without fear or favour, affection or ill will. So help me God. “ ”17. Justices to assist public (3) Justices of the peace shall assist members of the public, at their request, in formulating informations in respect of offences.”

Breached s2 objects s6 s9 s10 s16 Victims Bill of Rights by dishonestly and with partiality acting without jurisdiction to defraud Criminal Code s482(1) “any act of parliament”;

2 Preamble Whereas crime has a harmful impact on victims and on society; Whereas victims of crime and their families deserve to be treated with **courtesy, compassion and respect, including respect for their dignity**; Whereas it is important that **victims’ rights be considered throughout the criminal justice system**; Whereas **victims of crime have rights that are guaranteed by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms**; Whereas consideration of the rights of victims of crime is in the interest of the proper administration of justice ...

2.. victim means an individual who has suffered physical or emotional harm, property damage or economic loss as the result of the commission or alleged commission of an offence.

General information 6 Every victim has the **right, on request, to information** about the criminal justice system and the role of victims in it; the services and programs available to them as a victim, including restorative justice programs; and their right to file a complaint for an infringement or denial of any of their rights under this Act.

Security 9 Every victim has the right to **have their security considered** by the appropriate authorities in the criminal justice system.

Protection from intimidation and retaliation 10 Every victim has the right to have reasonable and necessary measures taken by the appropriate authorities in the criminal justice system to **protect the victim from intimidation and retaliation**.

Restitution order 16 Every victim has the right to have the court consider making a **restitution order against the offender**.

Deliberately defrauding s12, 21 Interpretations Act by dishonestly and with partiality acting without jurisdiction to breach constitutional rule of law right self defence from ongoing crimes object of criminal code / Enactments Remedial, Enactments deemed remedial 12 Every enactment is deemed remedial, and shall be given such fair, large and liberal construction and interpretation as best ensures the **attainment**

of its objects. Corporations: Powers vested in corporations 21 (1) Words establishing a corporation shall be construed (a) **as vesting in the corporation power to sue and be sued**,.....(d) as exempting from **personal liability** for its debts, obligations or **acts individual members of the corporation who do not contravene the provisions of the enactment establishing the corporation.**

Breached s362 Criminal Code; Para 4 of August 10 decision re JP **Jocelyn St Jean** “Information, which was not sworn, was not properly before the court” pretending it was an s507.1 hearing, “she did not have jurisdiction to proceed”, “you were refusing to leave ... she would request security to escort you” is a deliberate misrepresentation of refusal to comply with s3, s17(3) Justice of Peace Act, Canada Victims Bill of Rights s2 objects, 6, 9, 10, 16 Charter of Rights s9, s10, s12 s15 / s1(a,b,e), s2(a,b,c,e) Canada Bill of Rights complaint against JP St Jean, because she was not asked to proceed with a hearing, by refusing to answer a scheduling question, she treated me like a criminal lying that about Canadian Judicial Council. It is beyond St Jean jurisdiction to violate s9 s10 Victims Bill of Rights Criminal Code s265(1a,b)(3c,d) assault, s346(1.1b) extortion, s380(1a) fraud, s341, s423.1(b) intimidation, by threatening injury against a victim that she swore to assist by refusing to answer how to set a separate full day hearing date for s579 Criminal Code Constitutional Question / s504 s507.1 hearing, in order to demean me she threatened injury to defraud questions that she has duties to answer.

Breached s362 Criminal Code; Para 5 of August 10 decision re JP **Jocelyn St Jean** “outside the jurisdiction of Council” is a false statement because any criminal code offence is automatic “(ii) conduct that is incompatible with the due execution of his or her office, or (iii) failure to perform the duties of his or her office.”

Breached s362 Criminal Code; Para 5 of August 10 decision re JP **Jocelyn St Jean** “no evidence of judicial misconduct” is a false statement because the motive for refusal to comply with s3 Justice of Peace Act oath office duty to “execute the duties of a justice of the peace... without fear or favour, affection or ill will”, 17(3) “shall assist members of the public, at their request, in formulating informations in respect of offences” by refusing to send up the original 16-30604 file so that the February 6 intake JP who was willing to correct the error on the intake form could not correct the error (some pages had Justice of the Peace Anna Blauveldt signatures, some did not). Both the intake JP and myself spent about 1 hour trying to get the 16-30604 file through the Registry, JP St Jean refused in order to buy time to devise a strategy to defraud the 16-30604 prosecution, which is s21b party to offences by the Canadian Judicial Council s139(1)(2)(3a) obstruction of justice defrauding s2 s482 s504 s507.1 s540 s551.2 s551.3(1g Charter) 683(2) s788 s802 criminal code.

Breached s341 Criminal Code; Criminal Code 788 “do all other things” gives **St Jean** broad powers to process s504, and schedule or decide the s579 Constitutional Question that will prevent Crown from staying prosecution without breaching ongoing crime self defence constitutional rule of law.

Defrauding s2 objects s6 Victims Bill of Rights / s12 s15 Charter Rights / s17(3) Justice of Peace Act: “Whereas crime has a harmful impact on victims and on society; Whereas victims of crime and their families deserve to be treated with **courtesy, compassion and respect, including respect for their dignity**; Whereas it is important that **victims’ rights be considered throughout the criminal justice system**; Whereas **victims of crime have rights that are guaranteed by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms**; Whereas consideration of the rights of victims of crime is in the interest of the proper administration of justice”. General information 6 Every victim has the **right, on request, to**

information about the criminal justice system and the role of victims in it; the services and programs available to them as a victim,” Her Worship Justice of the Peace Jocelyne A. **St Jean** mocked me when I asked for her name, this is cruel treatment of a victim of Canadian Judicial Council party to Conservative Party racism and Canadian Judicial Council; criminal misconduct, she laughed and said do I want to add her to the list of CJC crimes. Then Crown Counsel Brian Redman also mocked me by saying that Her Worship Justice of the Peace Jocelyne A. St Jean would be in good company.

Defrauding s24 Charter Rights; “R. V. Sharkey, 2014 ONCJ 437 (CANLII) I conclude that I have the power to issue a declaration of invalidity under the Charter. That decision is, according the principles of stare decisis, not binding on any other judge. They are free to follow it or not. In my view, they are free to follow it whether or not there is a Charter application in the case before them” is evidence of the s24 Charter right of a criminal code “victim” “prosecutor” to bring an s579 constitutional question before an s507.1 hearing is “property” “valuable public service”, but on February 6, 2017 at court room 14 of the Ottawa Ontario Court of Justice **JP Jocelyne A. St Jean** breached s139(1)(2)(3a) by acts that include refusing to tell me how to obtain 15(1)(2)(3)(4) Justice of Peace Act hearing before a judge. She refused 788 “do all other things” Criminal Code delegated power to set Criminal Code Constitutional Question date and receive the s504 information under oath and refer it to a judge.

Breached s362 Criminal Code; Para 4 of August 10 decision re **JP Herbert Kreling** “decision that a hearing would not be scheduled was ... a decision made by a higher court”, JP Kreling had no jurisdiction to make a decision to prevent JP Anna Blaudveldt file 16-30604 from signing a decision she already made, para 4 statement is a misrepresentation of Olumide v Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Ontario, 2017 ONSC 1201 [12] The Crown submits that because Mr. Olumide’s intended private prosecutions are authorized by the Criminal Code, they are not barred by a vexatious litigant order under s. 140 of the Courts of Justice Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. C-43.[13] .. **an entitlement granted by the Criminal Code cannot be constrained by a court order** granted under provincial legislation ... [19] In the Court’s view, the **injunctive relief requested is beyond the Court’s jurisdiction** in that it would restrict the right of a private citizen to lay an information under section 504 of the Criminal Code and thus is arguably not permissible. .. [20] In summary, **the Court will not issue an injunction** preventing Mr. Olumide from attempting to launch private presentations without leave of the Court.

Breached s362 Criminal Code; Para 5 of August 10 decision re **JP Herbert Kreling** “your allegations about the Justice of Peace were based on speculation”, JP St Jean ordered a meeting with Olumide and JP Anna Blaudveldt, the fact that JP Kreling acted without jurisdiction to defraud the meeting so as to defraud an existing s504 s507.1 decision, has been admitted by Council, therefore the allegations cannot be speculation. This is a public space beside the entrance of the court there is a recording of me showing a piece of paper to write his name. JP Blaudveldt and Ottawa Police Officer Andrew Milton witnessed the assault and conversation in a public space. Ottawa Police Officer Andrew Milton will testify that he saw me asking the JP for his name, that he saw me asking for permission to get his name, that he denied that permission and that it was only when I was outside the court house that he gave me the JP’s name. Council sighted a “security issue” as JP Kreling reason for arrest and assault, but did not say what that security issue is, that is an admission that asking a JP for his name is not a security issue, he had already succeeded in extortion, but he went further because he thinks black males are criminals, he is afraid of me, he thinks blacks do not deserve equal treatment and must be put in the place, he thinks caucasian political careers are more important than black political careers and wanted to teach me a lesson for daring to act in self-defence against racists. I have a right to be in the public area of the court house,

right to go to the registry to obtain his name, he has a duty to tell me his name, neither him nor council can tell me the security reason for arrest / assault which is a violation of preamble objects s7 s9 s10 s12 s15 Charter of Rights, preamble objects, s1(a,b,e), s2(a,b,c,e) Canada Bill of Rights against racist revictimization of victim with mens rae to retain proceeds of racism principle of fundamental justice;

- a) Enforcement of guaranteed rights and freedoms. 24. (1) **Anyone** whose rights or freedoms, as guaranteed by this Charter, have been infringed or denied **may apply to a court** of competent jurisdiction to obtain such remedy as the court considers appropriate and just in the circumstances.
- b) Charter of Rights “Arrest or detention 10. Everyone has the right on arrest or detention (a) to be informed promptly of the reasons therefor;”
- c) Canadian Bill of Rights “(c) deprive a person who has been arrested or detained (i) of the right to be informed promptly of the reason for his arrest or detention,”
- d) s81b Police Services Act **Inducing misconduct** 81. (1) No person shall, ..(b) induce or attempt to induce a police officer to commit misconduct. Offence (3) A person who contravenes subsection (1) or (2) is guilty of an offence
- a) s2 objects s6 s9 s10 s16 Victims Bill of Rights Security 9 Every victim has the right to **have their security considered** by the appropriate authorities in the criminal justice system. Protection from intimidation and retaliation 10 Every victim has the right to have reasonable and necessary measures taken by the appropriate authorities in the criminal justice system to **protect the victim from intimidation and retaliation.**
- e) Criminal Code s139(1)(2)(3a) obstruction of justice, s140(1b) mischief, s265(1a,b)(3c,d) assault, s346(1.1b) extortion, s380(1a) fraud, s341, s423.1(b) intimidation, **Public mischief** 140 (1) Every one commits public mischief who, with intent to mislead, causes a peace officer to enter on or continue an investigation by (a) making a false statement that accuses some other person of having committed an offence; (b) **doing anything** intended to cause some other person to be suspected of having committed an offence that the other person has not committed, or to divert suspicion from himself; (c) reporting that an offence has been committed when it has not been committed; or

Breached s362 Criminal Code; Para 6 of August 10 decision re JP **Herbert Kreling** “outside the jurisdiction of the Council” is a false statement because any criminal code offence is automatic “(ii) conduct that is incompatible with the due execution of his or her office, or (iii) failure to perform the duties of his or her office.”

Breached s362 Criminal Code by falsely stating in September 18 **JP Hiscox** decision para 2 “The Committee noted that ... you appear to be using the Council’s complaints process to obtain a remedies that you were not successful in obtaining through the courts.”, because the remedy “Council shall “warn” or “reprimand” or “education” or “removal” for “(ii) conduct that is incompatible with the due execution of his or her office, or (iii) failure to perform the duties of his or her office” is a remedy that has never been sought in a court, nor does any court have jurisdiction to grant “warn” or “reprimand” or “education” or “removal” remedy.

Breached s362 Criminal Code by falsely stating in September 18 **JP Hiscox** decision para 3 “The Committee Noted that in the version of the events described in your complaint, it appeared that His Worship made a decision that he would not grant your request to lay criminal charges and you persisted in trying to have the charges laid”, because my complaint was “I said he needs to write his name on the sheet I was handing to him; he said NO, he is asking me to leave.”, that is not persisted in trying to have the charges laid, that is persisted in obtaining evidence he read the letter and signed a s504 s24 refusal;

a) Enforcement of guaranteed rights and freedoms. 24. (1) **Anyone** whose rights or freedoms, as guaranteed by this Charter, have been infringed or denied **may apply to a court** of competent jurisdiction to obtain such remedy as the court considers appropriate and just in the circumstances.

Breached s362 Criminal Code by falsely stating in September 18 **JP Hiscox** decision para 3 “Without an audio recording, the committee was unable to determine on a balance of probabilities what actually occurred”, the complaint states “a female police officer waiting to see him witnessed the altercation. others gathered at the door to watch the scene, at least 3 to 5 other witnesses can corroborate this account.”, further counter staff (more witnesses) initially refused to process the mandamus application that same day, they did so after speaking with JP Hiscox for about 20 minutes, he walked past me after speaking with them, he did not challenge my facts or remedy his crime. Further this happened beside the security screening area beside the entrance of the court, therefore there must be audio video footage of a 6ft man standing up while I was seated, hands in the air like Hitler berating me to leave his office.

Breached s362 Criminal Code by falsely stating in September 18 **JP Hiscox** decision para 4 “it is not judicial misconduct for a justice of the peace to decline to issue criminal charges”, because The front page of Ontario Court of Justice s504 s507.1 information form 17(3) Justice of Peace Act “duty to assist” by unambiguously and clearly stating that "As a citizen, you have the right to appear before a Justice of the Peace to lay charges against another person by swearing to an Information. A Justice of Peace must receive the Information if it meets the statutory provisions of the Criminal Code of Canada.”, AND there is no jurisdiction to change *Olumide v Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Ontario*, 2017 ONSC “[9] The current case law holds that a **Justice of the Peace cannot decline to accept an information**. Justice Code in *Waskowec v. Ontario*, 2014 ONSC 1646 (CanLII) held that the powers of a Justice of the Peace under s. 504 of the Criminal Code are purely ministerial with no place for judicial discretion; at para 11:”

Breached s362 Criminal Code by falsely stating in September 18 **JP Hiscox** decision para 4 “it is not judicial misconduct for a justice of the peace to ... request that a person leave ...”, because the complaint states “I need Council to let me know if 6ft JP Hiscox yelling, berating and refusing to allow a victim of crimes to report a crime is part of the job description... I said he needs to write his name on the sheet I was handing to him; he said NO, he is asking me to leave.”

Breached s341 Criminal Code false pretence by stating in September 18 **JP Hiscox** decision para 5 by stating “..the has no legal authority to compel any judicial officer to schedule a hearing or to require that criminal charges be laid” in order to fraudulently conceal relief “Council shall “warn” or “reprimand” or “education” or “removal” of ... Toronto Peterborough JP Hiscox P ... re “11.2(2b) “(ii) conduct that is incompatible with the due execution of his or her office, (iii) failure to perform the duties of his or her office” that include the following criminal code offences that are before the complaints committee;”

Breached s362 Criminal Code by falsely stating in September 18 **JP Dresher** decision para 2 “The Committee noted that ... you appear to be using the Council’s complaints process to obtain a remedies that you were not successful in obtaining through the courts.”, because the remedy “Council shall “warn” or “reprimand” or “education” or “removal” for “(ii) conduct that is incompatible with the due execution of his or her office, or (iii) failure to perform the duties of his or her office” is a remedy that has never been sought in a court, nor does any court have jurisdiction to grant “warn” or “reprimand” or “education” or “removal” remedy.

Breached s362 Criminal Code by falsely stating in September 18 **JP Dresher** decision para 3 “.matters outside the jurisdiction of the Council”, because Council has jurisdiction over the relief “Council shall “warn” or “reprimand” or “education” or “removal” of ...JP K Drescher ... re “11.2(2b) “(ii) conduct that is incompatible with the due execution of his or her office, (iii) failure to perform the duties of his or her office” that include the following criminal code offences ...”

Breached s21b Criminal Code by September 18 **JP Dresher** dishonestly and with partiality making a verbal false statement (refused to write) that she had no s504 jurisdiction over the Ontario Court of Appeal, she committed party to offences by the 3 accused Ontario Court of Appeal, Canadian Judicial Council, Office Public Sector Integrity Commissioner.

Breached s362 Criminal Code by falsely stating in September 18 **JP Dresher** decision para 3 “...the justice of the peace to request the assistance of security to have you removed from the courtroom was a matter of judicial decision making” Because JP Dresher did not request security, there was no court room, in her office, she said she would sign the refusal after I left her office, I left immediately, she broke her promise and sent out the documents 10 minutes later without signing, this means she took time to read the letter, knew she was committing a crime and refused to sign in order to hide the evidence.

Defrauding JP s504 Jurisdiction; I told **JP K Dresher** that the s504 test is whether the offence is drafted in accordance to the criminal code, s784 Criminal Code is property and service, so she has to receive the s504 information, she proceeded to without any evidence prejudge the s507.1 hearing and decide that acting without jurisdiction to defraud s784 is not a crime, by lying that she lacked jurisdiction to issue an s504 information against Ontario Court of Appeal for acting without jurisdiction to defraud s784 criminal code right to appeal, s504, s380 right to service;

- b) Superior Court Justice Hackland defrauded R v McHale by lying that proceedings authorized by Criminal Code s504 s507.1 s551.3(1g Charter) are not a criminal proceedings, lying that he has absolute criminal code immunity and pretending that there was no Recusal Application before him.
- c) Superior Court Justice Salmers lied that he has insufficient information (same 2000 pages before JP Hiscox was before Salmers) re mandamus re defrauding s2 s482 s504 s507.1 s540 s551.2 s551.3(1g Charter) 683(2) s788 s802 re prosecution of persons that include Ontario Court of Appeal, Ontario Superior Court, Her Majesty The Queen In Right Of Ontario, Ontario Provincial Police.
- d) Olumide v Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Ontario, 2017 ONSC “[9] The current case law holds that a **Justice of the Peace cannot decline to accept an information**. Justice Code in Waskowec v. Ontario, 2014 ONSC 1646 (CanLII) held that the powers of a Justice of the Peace under s. 504 of the Criminal Code are purely ministerial with no place for judicial discretion; at para 11.”
- e) Fraud 380 (1) Every one who, by deceit, falsehood or other fraudulent means, whether or not it is a false pretence within the meaning of this Act, defrauds the public or any person, whether ascertained or not, of any property, money or valuable security or **any service**,

- f) Enforcement of guaranteed rights and freedoms. 24. (1) **Anyone** whose rights or freedoms, as guaranteed by this Charter, have been infringed or denied **may apply to a court** of competent jurisdiction to obtain such remedy as the court considers appropriate and just in the circumstances.

Judicial Immunity Falsehood; I told JP K Dresher that the letter to her includes about 20 authorities showing there is no Ontario Court of Appeal judicial immunity from s139 obstruction of justice criminal prosecution, no judicial immunity for deliberating acting without jurisdiction to defraud s784 statutory appeal rights in order to facilitate acting without jurisdiction to defraud initial s504 s507.1 s551.3(1g Charter) rights, deliberating refusing jurisdiction, deliberating acting in excess of jurisdiction, deliberating abusing discretionary power to contravene the objects of the Act, deliberate falsehoods to defraud property and service. Without any authority, JP K Dresher contradicted *Bourbonnais v. Canada* by lying that Justice Hackland can exercise discretion to do whatever he pleases, and the only recourse is an appeal (this is false, but if it were true, then defrauding s784 appeal right is a crime). *Bourbonnais v. Canada* (Attorney General), [2006] 4 FCR 170, 2006 FCA 62 (CanLII) [26].... judicial immunity does not apply where it is shown that a judge knowingly acts **beyond his jurisdiction**....[28]... “Of course, if the judge has ...**has perverted the course of justice, he can be punished in the criminal courts.**”

Council Immunity Falsehood; I told JP K Dresher whether the accused is Canadian Judicial Council or Office Public Sector Integrity Commissioner the test is the same, inciting criminal misconduct or inciting criminal wrongdoing by refusing to respond to 1 year of over 30 complaints of criminal misconduct is a contravention of the objects of enabling Acts, I also explained that the only response I ever received, sighted Justice Hackland discriminatory “deficiencies with English language” comments as reason for defrauding the application, I explained that despite over 30 counts of fraud against Superior Court Justice Hackland, the Ontario Court of Appeal committed triple discrimination by defrauding final order jurisdiction over Conservative party discrimination case. Canadian Judicial Council are using the same denial of equal treatment discrimination playbook to contravene the objects of the Act, therefore they do not have any protection for bad faith. I tried to quote s12 s21 Canada Interpretations Act duty to comply with objects, but JP K Dresher without any authority lied that public officers can exercise discretion to do anything, and the only recourse is an appeal

Defrauding JP Criminal Law Jurisdiction; I told JP K Dresher that criminal law is the Constitution Acts 1867 to 1982 Legislative Authority of Parliament of Canada 91 ‘Criminal Law... including the **Procedure in Criminal Matters**’ constitutional jurisdiction of the federal government, s482 criminal code precludes any rule that changes the criminal code, therefore s504 s507.1 s551.3(1g Charter) is “property” and “service” given to me by Parliament, and it is a crime for her to defraud me of “property” and “service”, I highlighted 15(2)(3)(4) Justice of Peace Act letter and front page of information, which is more evidence that refusal of s2 ”prosecutor” 482 s504 s507.1 s540 s551.2 s551.3(1g Charter) 683(2) s788 s802 is a breach of s21(b), s22.2, s23, 25.1(9)(11b), s139(1)(2)(3a), s341, s380 criminal code.

Defrauding s24 Charter Rights; I told JP K Dresher that per the 15(2)(3)(4) Justice of Peace letter, she needs to refer the hearing of the constitutional question / s507.1 criminal code to a judge, she said Ontario Court of Justice does not have jurisdiction to hear a constitutional questions, I told her that is not true, this court ruled differently in *R. v. Sharkey*, 2014 ONCJ 437, she ignored this because it did not support her intent to commit fraud. JP K Dresher acted dishonestly and with partiality by acting without jurisdiction to defraud s63(2) Judges Act / 3f An Act respecting the office of the Director of Public Prosecutions / s579 Criminal Code overbroad constitutional questions.

Defrauding Objects of Council / Victims / Charter / Canadian Bill of Rights ; Committee decision that it is acceptable to decide JP Ralph motive refusing positive obligation to respond to application record scheduling request without knowing **JP Ralph** reason for not responding is an impermissible violation of the s13(3)(2) Maintaining the high quality of the justice system objects of Council / s2 objects, 6, 9, 10, 16 Charter of Rights s9, s10, s12 s15 / s1(a,b,e), s2(a,b,c,e) Canada Bill of Rights / s2 objects, s6, s16 Victims Bill of Rights / s10 Ontario Interpretation Act / s12, 21 Canada Interpretations Act / s3 Oath / s17(3) Justice of Peace Act duty to assist because it is an endorsement of past criminal misconduct, facilitation of ongoing criminal misconduct, incitement of future criminality. He had a duty to either schedule the hearing or provide the procedure to schedule the hearing against Canadian Judicial Council, therefore 16-30604 against the Canadian Judicial Council is still seating in limbo.

Breached s362 Criminal Code in para 4, May 31 **JP Warren Ralph** decision “it is not judicial misconduct for a justice of the peace to decline to respond” to defraud “inaction” “positive obligation” common law, s3 oath, 17(3) “shall assist members of the public, at their request, in formulating informations in respect of offences” with 15(4) hearing with mens rae to facilitate ongoing s2 s482 s504 s507.1 s540 s551.2 s551.3(1g Charter) 683(2) s788 s802 crimes by Ontario Court of Justice.

- a) Johnston et al. v. Prince Edward Island, 1995 CanLII 10509 (NL SCTD) [302]... *City of Kamloops v. Nielsen*, 1984 CanLII 21 (SCC), [1984] 2 S.C.R. 2, at p. 24, by Wilson, J., in these words: 'In my view, **inaction for no reason or inaction for an improper reason cannot be ... bona fide exercise of discretion**. Where the question whether the requisite action should be taken has not even been considered by the public authority, or at least has not been considered in good faith...,
- b) Gosselin v. Québec (Attorney General), [2002] 4 SCR 429, 2002 SCC 84 [319] ...rights include a **positive dimension**, such that they are not merely rights of non-interference but also what might be described as **rights of “performance”**, then they may be **violable by mere inaction...**,

Breached s341 Criminal Code false pretence in para 4 of May31decision re **JP Ralph** by stating “The Committee further noted that the Council has no legal authority to compel any judicial officer to schedule a hearing and that was a matter outside the jurisdiction of the Council” by misrepresenting relief “Council shall “warn” or “reprimand” or “education” or “removal” JP Ralph “failure to perform the duties of his or her office” that include Justice Of Peace Act s3 s17(3), Criminal Code s2 s482 s504 s507.1 s507.1(7) s551.2 s551.3(1g) 683(2) s788 s802 statutory scheduling duty.

Breached s362 Criminal Code Para 5 of May 31 decision re **JP Ralph** by falsely stating “... not judicial misconduct” despite Criminal Code s21b s23 s22.2, 25.1(9)(11b), party to offence motive for refusing s3 s17(3) Justice of Peace Act s2 s482 s504 s507.1 s540 s551.2 s551.3(1g Charter) 683(2) s788 s802 statutory scheduling duty is jurisdiction of Council because it is “(ii) conduct that is incompatible with the due execution of his or her office, or (iii) failure to perform the duties of his or her office”.

Breached s362 Criminal Code by falsely stating in May 31 **JP Ralph** decision para 3 “... using the Council’s complaints process to obtain a remedy you were not successful at obtaining through the courts.” Because the remedy “Council shall “warn” or “reprimand” or “education” or “removal” for “(ii) conduct that is incompatible with the due execution of his or her office, or (iii) failure to perform the duties of his or her office” is a remedy that has never been sought in a court, nor does any court have jurisdiction to grant “warn” or “reprimand” or “education” or “removal” remedy.

Breached s362 Criminal Code; Para 3, 5 of January 15, 2018 decision re JP D.M. **McAleer** (named in error as JP Cheryl McLean due to initial refusal to release transcript) “outside the jurisdiction of the Council” is a false statement because any criminal code offence is “(ii) conduct that is incompatible with the due execution of his or her office, or (iii) failure to perform the duties of his or her office.”

Relief Sought; Take Notice that pursuant to s3, s9.1, 15, 16 Statutory Powers Procedure Act, applicant hereby bring an application **to be heard immediately** by the Justice of Peace Review Complaints Committee at 31 Adelaide Street East, Toronto, ON, seeking the following declaration;

- a) “Council shall “warn” or “reprimand” or “education” or “removal” of ... JP McAleer(name corrected after January 15 decision) ... re “11.2(2b) “(ii) conduct that is incompatible with the due execution of his or her office, (iii) failure to perform the duties of his or her office” that include the following prohibited criminal offences that bring the administration of justice into disrepute; 21b, 23, s22.2, 25.1(9)(11b), 139(2), 341, s380(1) criminal code offence of deliberately lying that s504 Criminal Code does not authorize prosecution of “person” “organization” “justice system participant” that include the Justice of Peace Review Council ... AND violating s22 Criminal Code by counselling 4 other trainee JPs at the November 8 hearing to commit crimes against me in the future prosecution of the Justice of Peace Review Council”

Your November 24 letter states that “it appears that you have legal questions about the situation when a judge declines to hear a constitutional question”, this is a violation of s362 Criminal Code because the November 13 and November 24 declaration sought was very clear. The fact that none of Council decisions in JPs Hiscox, St Jean, Ralph, Dresher, Kreling, McAleer(name corrected after January 15 decision) reproduced the exact wording of the declaratory relief sought is beyond all reasonable doubt evidence of premeditation to commit crime.

Further you know that any criminal code offence is prohibited conduct that brings the administration of justice into disrepute which is “conduct that is incompatible with the due execution of his or her office”, AND you know that JPs Hiscox, St Jean, Ralph, Dresher, Kreling, McAleer(name corrected after January 15 decision) violated the Criminal Code, therefore you make several statements in your November 24 letter with mens rae to deliberately misrepresent the declaratory relief before you, with mens rae to defraud jurisdiction.

The motive for this fraudulent misrepresentation is to cover up prior fraudulent misrepresentations that you lack “warn” or “reprimand” or “education” or “removal” jurisdiction over “conduct that is incompatible with the due execution of his or her office” (prohibited criminal offences that bring the administration of justice into disrepute) re JPs Hiscox, St Jean, Ralph, Dresher, Kreling arrest and assault of a victim of crime in order to extort victim’s Criminal Code s2”prosecutor” s482 s504 s507.1 s540 s551.2 s551.3(1g Charter) s683(2) s788 s802 / Canada Victims Bill of Rights rights s2 objects, 6, 9, 10, 16 / Charter of Rights s9, s10, s12 / Canada Bill of Rights s2(b,e) / Canada Interpretation Act s11 s12 s13 s21 s34 / Ontario Interpretation Act s10 / Justice of Peace Act 17(3) / rule of law against using public power to deliberately commit criminal offences.

In consideration that JP McAleer(name corrected after January 15 decision) contradicted the Justice of Peace Review Council by confirming JPs Hiscox, St Jean, Ralph, Dresher, Kreling subject of previous complaints to council, violated the criminal code and should be prosecuted as individuals, I know

council will violate s362 criminal code by falsely stating that you lack “warn” or “reprimand” or “education” or “removal” jurisdiction over her prohibited conduct criminal offences (“conduct that is incompatible with the due execution of his or her office”).

If JP McAleer(name corrected after January 15 decision) agreed with the Justice of Peace Review Council she would have taken the position that JPs Hiscox, St Jean, Ralph, Dresher, Kreling did not commit a crime and permitted me to provide evidence to meet each element of the test for each criminal offence. She knew that it would be impossible to rebut the test for each criminal offence, trapped she chose to lie that “person” “justice system participant” “organization” cannot be charged. I told her SNC Lavalin is being prosecuted for bribing Ghadaffi’s son, it made no difference. Her only choice was to charge Council or lie.

Even the Crown Counsel read from s22.2 Criminal Code and told her Mr Olumide is correct that an organization person justice system participant can be charged. Like Council, he wanted to rely on the vexatious criminal offence, both JP Gireault and JP McAleer(name corrected after January 15 decision) read Justice Hackland’s order and knew that Council reliance on the vexatious criminal offence was a crime, she decided to invent a new lie.

I hereby request confirmation that the Chief Justice of the Ontario Court of Justice has not been involved in any way in handling this complaint AND will not be involved in handling this complaint AND was not involved in drafting the November 24 letter or selecting the member of the committee. Failure to comply will be separate count in a future criminal prosecution of the Justice of Peace Review Council.

<http://www.duhaime.org/LegalDictionary/J/JudicialMisconduct.aspx>

..BEHAVIOR (Black's Law Dictionary) Misconduct Definition: **Conduct on the part of a judge that is prohibited** and which could lead to a form of discipline. ... judicial conduct include, generally, a **prohibition against conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice that could bring the judicial office into disrepute.** ...Examples of specific instances of judicial misconduct include: •The use of a harsh and angry tone and demeanor, •Excessive arrogance, •Lack of impartiality, •Incompetence, •**Criminal conduct**, •Conflict of interest, •An ethnic or racial slur, •Misuse of prestige of office, .. prejudgment, ..Administrative mismanagement ...

1. A November 8 out of town JP lied at the Ottawa Ontario Court of Justice that she is not bound by the order of the October 5 JP because even though the Criminal Code gives me the right to prosecute an organization and raise an s79 constitutional question to prevent that prosecution from being stayed by Ontario, she acted without jurisdiction and in bad faith by lying that I cannot prosecute an organization.

2. She also contravened the objects of the Justice of Peace Act by using the hearing to train about 4 other JPs on how to commit crimes, that is an s22 Criminal Code offence.

3. In consideration of the following constitutional and criminal code provisions, the November 8 JP is a criminal that acted in bad faith AND without jurisdiction to defraud the criminal code;

Constitution Acts, 1867 to 1982 52(1) states “Any law inconsistent with the provisions of the Constitution is, to the extent of the inconsistency, of no force or effect”

Constitution Acts 1867 to 1982 Legislative Authority of Parliament of Canada 91 ‘Criminal Law... including the **Procedure in Criminal Matters**;

Canada Victims Bill of Rights ...Restitution order 16 Every victim has the **right to have the court consider making a restitution order** against the offender.

Criminal Code 504 ..(a) that the **person** has committed, anywhere, an indictable offence that may be tried in the province in which the justice resides, and that the **person** is or is believed to be, or (ii) resides or is believed to reside, within the territorial jurisdiction of the justice; (b) that the **person**, wherever he may be, has committed an indictable offence within the territorial jurisdiction of the justice;

every one, person and owner, and similar expressions, include **Her Majesty** and an **organization**;

justice system participant means a member of the Senate, of the House of Commons, of a legislative assembly or of a municipal council, (b) a **person** who plays a role in the administration of criminal justice, including...a **prosecutor**, ... an officer of a **court**, a **judge and a justice**, an informant, a prospective witness,a peace officer within the meaning of any of paragraphs (b), (c), (d), (e) and (g) of the definition peace officer, a civilian employee of a police force, a person employed in the administration of a **court**, (viii.1) a **public officer** within the meaning of subsection 25.1(1) and a person acting at the direction of such an officer,

organization means a **public body**, body corporate, society, company, firm, partnership, trade union or municipality, or **an association of persons that is created for a common purpose**,
(ii) **has an operational structure**, and
(iii) **holds itself out to the public as an association of persons**; (organisation)

22.2 In respect of an offence that requires the prosecution to prove fault — other than negligence — an organization is a party to the offence if, with the intent at least in part to **benefit the organization**, **one of its senior officers** (a) acting within the scope of their authority, is a **party to the offence**;
(b) having the mental state required to be a party to the offence and acting within the scope of their authority, **directs the work of other representatives of the organization so that they do the act or make the omission specified in the offence**; or
(c) **knowing that a representative of the organization is or is about to be a party to the offence, does not take all reasonable measures to stop them from being a party to the offence.**

Protection of Persons Administering and Enforcing the Law

25.1 ... Principle (2) It is **in the public interest to ensure that public officers may effectively carry out their law enforcement duties in accordance with the rule of law** and,

Requirements for certain acts (9) **No public officer is justified in committing an act or omission that would otherwise constitute an offence and that would be likely to result in loss of or serious damage to property**....

Limitation (11) Nothing in this section justifies...

(b) **the wilful attempt in any manner to obstruct, pervert or defeat the course of justice**; or

Power to make rules 482 (1) Every superior court of criminal jurisdiction and every court of appeal may make rules of court not inconsistent with this or any other Act of Parliament, and any rules so made

apply to any **prosecution**, proceeding, action or **appeal**, as the case may be, within the **jurisdiction of that court**, instituted in relation to **any matter of a criminal nature** or arising from or incidental to any such **prosecution**, proceeding, action or **appeal**.

Judicial notice 781 (2) Proclamations, orders, rules, regulations and by-laws mentioned in subsection (1) and the publication thereof **shall be judicially noticed**.

Criminal Code s551.3 (1giii) "before the stage of the presentation of the evidence on the merits... adjudicating any issues that can be decided before that stageCharter of Rights and Freedoms"

Criminal Code 2 "prosecutorwhere the Attorney General does not intervene, means the person who institutes proceedings to which this Act applies",

482(3) "Purpose of rules..any other matter... to attain the ends of justice ...with respect to ..applications,

802 (1) The prosecutor is entitled personally to conduct his case ..

802 (2) The prosecutor or defendant, as the case may be, may examine .. witnesses

802 (3) Every witness at a trial in proceedings ... shall be examined under oath.

4. November 8 JP acted in bad faith by collaterally attacking October 5 JP Order that the 1st item to be addressed would be the s579 Criminal Code Constitutional Question and refused to allow witness evidence under oath with mens rae to facilitate ongoing crimes,

5. then she violated objects s16 Victims Bill of Rights by lying that she lacked jurisdiction because only individuals can be prosecuted, lied that organizations or corporations cannot be prosecuted,

6. the prosecutor told the JP and Crown Prosecutor to their face, that they are criminals, therefore if there is no Crown response to below mentioned grounds, it is an admission that they are both criminals.

7. Whereas November 8 JP lost immunity for acting without jurisdiction to change the criminal code with mens rae to defraud Criminal Code services.

In *Morier et al. v. Rivard et al* (1985), [1985 CanLII 26 \(SCC\)](#), 23 D.L.R. (4th) 1 (S.C.C.), the majority considered the extent and nature of the **immunity** conferred on superior court judges in Canada, and concluded that it is essentially absolute, allowing for potential liability only where a judge is shown to have **knowingly exceeded his jurisdiction in bad faith**.

But an act done in complete absence of all jurisdiction cannot be a judicial act. It is no more than the **act of a private citizen, pretending to have judicial power** which does not exist at all. In such circumstances, to grant absolute judicial immunity is contrary to the **public policy expectation that there shall be a Rule of Law**. *Piper v. Pearson*, id., 2 Gray 120.

"**No judicial process**, whatever form it may assume, can have any lawful authority outside of the limits of the jurisdiction of the court or judge by whom it is issued; and **an attempt to enforce it beyond these boundaries is nothing less than lawless violence**." *Ableman v. Booth*, 21 Howard 506 (1859).

"**Where there is no jurisdiction, there can be no discretion**, for discretion is incident to jurisdiction." *Piper v. Pearson*, 2 Gray 120, cited in *Bradley v. Fisher*, 13 Wall. 335, 20 L.Ed. 646 (1872)

When a judge knows that he lacks jurisdiction, or acts in the face of **clearly valid statutes expressly depriving him of jurisdiction**, judicial immunity is lost. Rankin v. Howard, (1980) 633 F.2d 844, cert den. Zeller v. Rankin, 101 S.Ct. 2020, 451 U.S. 939, 68 L.Ed 2d 326.

8. Whereas November 8 criminal pretending to be a JP has no rebuttal to s482(1) Criminal Code that reinforces Parliament of Canada s91 Constitution Act exclusive jurisdiction over the criminal code by stating in s482(1) that no court do anything to contravene express provisions in the criminal code.

9. Whereas November 8 criminal pretending to be a JP has no rebuttal to s12 Canada Interpretation Act, objects s16 Canada Victims Bill of Rights that prevent misinterpretation of the criminal code “organization” “person” “justice system participant” in order to contravene the self-defence to ongoing crimes objects of Criminal Code.

10. Whereas November 8 criminal pretending to be a JP has no rebuttal to s21 Canada Interpretation Act allows prosecution of any created by statute organization that contravenes the objects of the incorporating Act. “Powers vested in corporations 21 (1) Words establishing a corporation shall be construed (a) as vesting in the corporation power to sue and be sued, to contract and be contracted with by its corporate name, to have a common seal and to alter or change it at pleasure, to have perpetual succession, to acquire and hold personal property for the purposes for which the corporation is established and to alienate that property at pleasure; (d) as exempting from personal liability for its debts, obligations or acts individual members of the corporation who do not contravene the provisions of the enactment establishing the corporation.”

11. Whereas November 8 criminal pretending to be a JP lied that if Ontario Court of Justice was convicted of a crime that would make her guilty of the same crime is a misrepresentation of the fact that the neither the criminal code nor common law defines an organization or corporation as an individual.

12. Whereas November 8 criminal pretending to be a JP has no rebuttal to the common law fact when a senior officer of an organization commits a crime and the organization benefits from the crime, the organization can be prosecuted.

13. Whereas November 8 criminal pretending to be a JP has no rebuttal to fact that the Crown fraudulently stayed JP Millar sworn information against Her Majesty The Queen In Right of Canada, Federal Court, Federal Court of Appeal, Supreme Court as criminal code “organization” “person” “justice system participant” AND JP Blaudveldt swore the information against Canadian Judicial Council as an organization because the right to prosecute an organization is a criminal code entitlement.

14. Whereas November 8 criminal pretending to be a JP has no rebuttal to Olumide v Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Ontario, 2017 ONSC 1201 [13] .. **an entitlement granted by the Criminal Code cannot be constrained by a court order granted under provincial legislation** ... [19] ...the injunctive relief requested is **beyond the Court’s jurisdiction**..

15. Although the Crown was not an accused, Whereas November 8 criminal pretending to be a JP has no rebuttal to fact that s18(2) Crown Liability and Proceedings Act creates a narrow Criminal Code immunity for the Crown therefore s504 criminal code is binding on Her Majesty The Queen, and there is

no Parliament of Canada legislation anywhere in the country that gives a court or judicial council or any other person or organization or justice system participant criminal code immunity.

Crown Liability and Proceedings Act Crown liable for disclosure 18: Saving provision(2)

(a) with the consent of the originator of the communication or of the person intended by the originator to receive it; (b) in the course of or for the purpose of giving evidence in any civil **or criminal proceedings** or in any other proceedings in which the servant of the Crown may be required to give evidence on oath; (c) in the course of or for the purpose of any criminal investigation if the private communication or radio-based telephone communication was not unlawfully intercepted;

(f) where disclosure is made to a peace officer or prosecutor in Canada or to a person or authority with responsibility in a foreign state for the investigation or prosecution of offences and is intended to be in the interests of the administration of justice in Canada or elsewhere.

16. Whereas November 8 criminal pretending to be a JP had no rebuttal to judicial notice of fact commonly known to the community that SNC Lavalin is being prosecuted as criminal code “organization” “person” “justice system participant” for bribery re Ghadaffi’s son.

17. Whereas the prosecutor would have trapped the November 8 criminal pretending to be a JP when he began to question her on which criminal code text or legislation or case law she was relying on as jurisdiction to change the content of the s504 criminal code “organization” “person” “justice system participant”, but co criminal Crown Counsel Giegen Millar jumped in to stop her from answering the question, because he knew that November 8 criminal pretending to be a JP would is caught in a lie.

USING S140 COURTS JUSTICE ACT FRAUD TO WITHOUT JURISDICTION DEFRAUD VICTIMS BILL OF RIGHTS S2 OBJECTS, 6, 9, 10, 16 / CHARTER OF RIGHTS S9, S10, S12 S15 / S1(A,B,E), S2(A,B,C,E) CANADA BILL OF RIGHTS AGAINST CRIMINAL REVICTIMIZATION OF VICTIM WITH MENS RAE TO RETAIN PROCEEDS OF CRIME PRINCIPLE OF FUNDAMENTAL JUSTICE / INTERPRETATION ACT S11 S12 S13 S21 S34 / ONTARIO INTERPRETATION ACT S7 S10 / JUSTICE OF PEACE ACT S3 OATH, S17(3) / RULE OF LAW AGAINST USING PUBLIC POWER TO DELIBERATELY COMMIT CRIMINAL OFFENCES, IS AN S21B CRIMINAL CODE OFFENCE.

Breached s22 criminal code Last paragraph August 10 decisions “will appear in ... Annual Report” is deliberately intended to mislead JPs that “Olumide v Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Ontario, 2017 ONSC 1201 [12] private prosecutions are authorized by the Criminal Code, they are ~~not~~ barred by a vexatious litigant order under s. 140 of the Courts of Justice Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. C-43.[13] .. an **entitlement granted by the Criminal Code cannot be constrained by a court order** granted under provincial legislation ... [19] ...the injunctive relief requested is **beyond the Court’s jurisdiction**” and incite other JPs, Judges and Ontario to loose immunity by acting without jurisdiction to defraud Olumide s2 s482 s504 s507.1 s540 s551.2 s551.3(1g Charter) 683(2) s788 s802 criminal code rights, Council has shown irrefutable evidence that they are for fraudulent purpose eviscerating the Criminal Code AND misleading JPs about consequence of acting without jurisdiction to facilitate crimes WITH mens rae to protect Justice of Peace Review Council, Ontario Court of Justice, Ontario Judicial Council from criminal prosecution which is s122 Criminal Code breach of trust for personal benefit;

Breached s21b Criminal Code party to s81b Police Services Act, s21b, s23, s22 person counselling, s22.2 organization party to offence, s25.1(9)(11b) public officer offence, s122 breach of trust use of public power against the public good in order to obtain personal benefit, s139(1)(2)(3a) obstruction of justice, s140(1b) inducing police to commit a crime by lying that a black male is a security risk, s265(1a,b)(3c,d) assault, s346(1.1b) extortion, s380(1a) fraud, s341 fraudulent concealment, s423.1(b) intimidation through “false pretence” “deceit, other fraudulent means” statements below;

Para 2 of August 10 decision re JP **Jocelyn St Jean** “you were declared a vexatious litigant”

Para 2 of August 10 decision re JP **Herbert Kreling** “you were declared a vexatious litigant”

Para 3 of the letter states that “you were declared a vexatious litigant”,

Para 2 of September 28 decision re Toronto JP **K Drescher** “you were declared a vexatious litigant”

Para 2 of September 28 decision re Peterborough JP **Hiscox P** “you were declared a vexatious litigant”

Para 2 of August 10 decision re JP **Jocelyn St Jean** “you were declared a vexatious litigant”

Para 2 of August 10 decision re JP **Herbert Kreling** “you were declared a vexatious litigant”

is mens rae intent to incite JPs to commit fraud by spreading a falsehood that a civil vexatious order has jurisdiction to defraud criminal code rights, prejudge of the outcome of a private prosecution of the s140 declaration that was obtained by mounting a collateral attack on Superior Court Justice Pollak decision to hear s140 Courts Justice Act constitutional question on the merits, collateral attack on Court of Appeal Justice Hourigan who granted leave to appeal and Court of Appeal judges lying about s6(2) Courts Justice Act jurisdiction in order to defraud s140 Courts Justice Act constitutional question.

R. v. Zlatic, [1993] 2 SCR 29, 1993 CanLII 135 (SCC) (i) Fraud by "Other Fraudulent Means" ...

Most frauds continue to involve either deceit or falsehood. As is pointed out in *Théroux*, proof of deceit or falsehood is sufficient to establish the *actus reus* of fraud; no further proof of dishonest action is needed. However, the third category of "other fraudulent means" has been used to support convictions in a number of situations where deceit or falsehood cannot be shown. These situations include, to date, the use of corporate funds for personal purposes, **non-disclosure of important facts**, exploiting the weakness of another, Dishonesty is, of course, difficult to define with precision. It does, however, connote an **underhanded design** which has the effect, or which engenders the risk, of depriving others of what is theirs. J. D. Ewart, in his *Criminal Fraud* (1986), defines dishonest conduct as that "which ordinary, decent people would feel was **discreditable** as being clearly **at variance with straightforward or honourable dealings**" (p. 99). The dishonesty of "other fraudulent means" has, at its heart, the wrongful use of something in which another person has an interest, in such a manner that this other's interest is extinguished or put at risk. A use is "wrongful" in this context if it constitutes conduct which reasonable decent persons would consider dishonest and **unscrupulous**.... The authorities make it clear that it is **unnecessary for a defrauding party to profit from his or her fraud** in order to be convicted; it is equally **unnecessary that the victims of a fraud suffer actual pecuniary loss** in order that the offence be made out: ...

Vexatious means that there has been a trial, and a judge applied the law to the facts and made a judgement and a litigant refused to accept the result. **Where there has never been a trial because judges lie to defraud jurisdiction**, the person making the fraudulent declaration and everyone relying on that fraudulent declaration in order to commit more crimes, is obviously a criminal.

Both Superior Court Justice Dunphy s140 declaration and the Court of Appeal lie that they lack s6(2) Courts Justice Act jurisdiction to determine the s140 Constitutional Question is illegal. The declaration

was obtained by fraudulent collateral attack on Superior Court Justice Pollak who dismissed Crown motion not to hear s140 Courts Justice Act constitutional question on the merits and collateral attack on Ontario Court of Appeal Justice Hourigan who granted leave to appeal, the mens rae motive for the conflict of interest collateral attack is to facilitate ongoing crimes by Ontario Court of Justice, Ontario Superior Court, Ontario Court of Appeal.

Illegal s140 order is one of the s504 counts of fraud, but Council has prejudged outcome of the s504 s507.1(7) s551.3(1g) without a hearing. Council's breached 21b any act or omission to facilitate ongoing crime, 23 facilitating escape from past crime, s22.2 organization party to offence, 25.1(9)(11b) public officer defrauding property, 139(1)(2)(3a) obstruction of justice, 340 fraudulent concealment.

As evidenced by the order of Justice Pollak and the appeal, it is obvious that if Pollak was allowed to hear the constitutional question s140 would have been read down, it is also obvious that if the Ontario Court of Appeal had not refused to hear the appeal of Justice Pollak order by lying about s6(2) Courts Justice Act jurisdiction the vexatious order would be void abinitio for lack of jurisdiction. For obvious reasons of avoiding self-incrimination the Ontario Court of Appeal lied that they did not have s6(2) Courts Justice Act jurisdiction to decide the s140 Courts Justice Act constitutional question.

The fact is that I challenged the constitutionality of s140 by showing that since there was **no existing proceeding against Ontario**, no finding of fact that Ontario did not break the Criminal Code, it was a breach of Rule Of Law Right To Self Defence From Ongoing Property Crimes / Right Against Criminals' Revictimization Of Victim Principle Of Fundamental Justice Is Part Of The Constitution to permit an s140 application without an existing proceeding against Ontario.

The consequences of s140 fraud by the Ontario Government include loss of home due to government fraud and government taxation powers to collect some of about \$100,000 costs by deliberate lies by judges with mens rae to defraud jurisdiction for tax fraud, defamation, discrimination and abuse of contract political career destruction.

Justice Pollak is not stupid, Ontario asked her to dismiss the motion, after 3 hours of arguments she refused Ontario's cross motion, adjourned Ontario's Application and agreed to decide the constitutionality of s140 on the merits and took time to reserve and write the order. Ontario and Metrolinx rushed to find another Justice Wilson who ordered the s140 application to proceed, even though Justice Pollak had been working on the order for about 2 weeks, and had not yet issued an order on whether s140 Courts Justice Act is constitutional, Wilson collateral attack on Justice Pollak caused her to issue an order the next day refusing to hear the s140 question. Justifying criminal proceeding fraud by using an illegally obtained civil vexatious order based on unconstitutional civil provincial legislation is illegal for the following reasons;

R. v. McHale, 2010 ONSC 887 (CanLII) [4] I agree with both parties that the present application is criminal in nature. **The provincial legislation has no application:** R. v. Storgoff, 1945 CanLII 17 (SCC), [1945] S.C.R. 526. Under Rule 43 of the Criminal Proceedings Rules, the application should be heard by a judge of the Superior Court in Cayuga.

Olumide v Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Ontario, 2017 ONSC 1201 [12] The Crown submits that because Mr. Olumide's intended private prosecutions are authorized by the Criminal Code, they are

not barred by a vexatious litigant order under s. 140 of the Courts of Justice Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. C-43.[13] .. an **entitlement granted by the Criminal Code cannot be constrained by a court order** granted under provincial legislation ... [19] ...the injunctive relief requested is **beyond the Court's jurisdiction**

Bourbonnais v. Canada (Attorney General), [2006] 4 FCR 170, 2006 FCA 62 (CanLII) [26].... judicial immunity does not apply where it is shown that a judge knowingly acts **beyond his jurisdiction**....[28]... “Of course, if the judge has ...**has perverted the course of justice, he can be punished in the criminal courts.**”

Excerpts Of Notice Of Appeal; S140 Courts Justice Act Relief

- 1) Declaration that the unprovoked treatment of hearing s140 application / appeal (costs of lawyer and cross examination) before s140 Constitutional Question is a breach of constitutional rule of law rights against criminal code violator reprisal on criminal code victim principle of fundamental justice because it permits an s140 application without an existing proceeding against the criminals.
- 2) Declaration that in light of s7 Interpretations Act “shall” judicial duty to Notice Legislative Fact that s7 Metrolinx Act “that agree to participate” grants freedom of choice to municipal property taxpayers ^{Finlay} to not agree to Presto, s140 Courts Justice Act breaches the constitutional rule of law against a law with an effect that is contrary to property crime self-defence objects of the Courts Justice Act, which is described in Criminal Code 35(1c,ii), 35(3), it shall be read down as unconstitutionally overbroad, the AG shall have 6 months to remedy s140.
- 3) s140 Courts Justice Act prohibition of s24 Charter liberty to access Court is a breach of;
 - a) constitutional rule of law against an overbroad law “that goes too far by denying the rights of some individuals in a way that bears no relation to” and contrary to property crime self-defence objects of Courts Justice Act, in Criminal Code 35(1c,ii), 35(3).
 - b) constitutional rule of law that vested s6 Courts Justice Act rights of appeal and inalienable rights against judicial discrimination not be destroyed by breaching rule of law rights against criminal code violator reprisal on criminal code victim principle of fundamental justice.
 - c) No Interpretations Act “public good” ^{Kallaba} in breaching s12 Charter through a without provocation overbroad extension of M44527 (no Presto matter proceeding without leave).

S140 Courts Justice Act shall be read down as **unconstitutionally overbroad**, the AG shall have 6 months to remedy s140.

- 4) Judicial Notice of fact known to community that David Chen shop keeper case “outrage” re treatment of a criminal code victim charged for breaking a law while acting in self-defence to property crime **shows societal consensus** ^{Prentice} on rights against criminal reprisal on a victim principle of fundamental justice which led to Bill C-26 Citizen’s Arrest Self-Defence Act criminal code “34(3)... threatened by another person... 35(1) lawfully assisting a person ...on ...grounds that another person...is about to take property...for the purpose of ...preventing another person from taking ... property”.

.....S6(2) Courts Justice Act Jurisdiction Relief

5) That Parliament intends to breach; s10 Interpretations Act property crime self-defence objects of Courts Justice Act, s138 Courts Justice Act Multiplicity of Proceedings AND interpretation common law by using “lies to the Divisional Court” in 6(1), 6(2), 19(1), 31 of the Courts Justice Act to mean the same thing all times except 6(2) AND s6(2) means this Court “has jurisdiction” where Divisional Court leave to appeal granted and 6(3) this Court “may on motion transfer” where Divisional Court leave to appeal granted, violates Supreme Court **rule of law against absurd illogical incoherent arbitrary statutory interpretation.**

6) Declaration that s6(2) words “has jurisdiction” precludes the Divisional Court from assuming jurisdiction before leave to appeal is granted, s6(3) words “may” is discretionary power to assume jurisdiction after the Divisional Court has granted leave to appeal, any panel order that refuses s6(2) Courts Justice Act jurisdiction over Justice Pollack’s order without stating the difference between s6(3) “already been commenced” and s6(2) not already been commenced, is grounds for a Canadian Judicial Complaint or criminal prosecution re misconduct of defrauding s6(2) statutory right for improper purpose of rewarding criminals by punishing the criminals’ victim.

7) s6(2) Courts Justice Act merits hearing of relief in paragraphs 3 – 11 of motion record Notice of Appeal of October 12 order, AND declaration that upon 3 hour arguments that led to refusal of cross motion to dismiss Constitutional Question on October 3 AND decision that October 17 application shall not proceed until an order that hearing the application is constitutional ^{RWDSU, Kallaba} AND s140 Courts Justice Act is not unconstitutionally overbroad, reversing the decision 5 days before the canceled October 17 hearing is a breach of rule of law rights against criminal reprisal on a victim **principle of fundamental justice** which led to Bill C-26 **Citizen’s Arrest Self-Defence Act.** RWDSU v. Dolphin Delivery Ltd., [1986] 2 SCR 573, 1986 CanLII 5 (SCC) The Charter will apply to any rule of the common law that ...directs an abridgement of a guaranteed right...**if an...order would infringe a Charter right, the Charter will apply to preclude the order**, and, by necessary implication, to modify the common law rule...**The courts are, of course, bound by the Charter;**

Kallaba v. Bylykbashi 2006 CanLII 3953 (ON CA), [2006] O.J. No. 545 (C.A.), [31] However, a s. 140(1) order is an extraordinary remedy that alters a person’s right to access the courts. Such an order may be granted in error. For example, a s. 140(1) order may not be supported by the evidential record. It may have been made by a **judge mistakenly acting without jurisdiction**, in breach of the **requirements of natural justice** or on **incorrect legal principles**. .. [39] In Ontario, s. 10 of the Interpretation Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. I.11 provides: 10. Every Act shall be deemed to be remedial, whether its immediate purport is to direct the doing of any thing that the Legislature deems to be for the public good or to **prevent** or punish the doing of any thing that it deems to be **contrary to the public good**, and shall accordingly receive such fair, large and liberal construction and interpretation as will best ensure the **attainment of the object** of the Act according to its **true intent**, meaning and spirit. ... (i) Purpose [112] The overarching purpose of the CJA when it was passed was “to comprehensively revise the legislation establishing Ontario courts and regulating their proceedings”. [2] As such, the CJA provides the important right of access to justice for the people of Ontario. **Access to justice is a fundamental pillar of the rule of law.** It provides litigants with the means to determine their rights and their freedoms. As MacPherson J.A. said in Carom v. Bre-X Minerals Ltd. (2000), 2000 CanLII 16886 (ON CA), 51 O.R. (3d) 236 (C.A.) at para. 5: “Quite clearly, effective access to justice is a precondition to the exercise of all other legal rights.”

ONTARIO JUDICIAL COUNCIL

Lise Maisonneuve Chair of Justice of Peace Review Council / Chief Justice Ontario Court of Justice refused Courts Justice Act 36(1) “The **Chief Justice** of the Ontario Court of Justice shall direct and supervise the sittings of the Ontario Court of Justice ...” with mens rae to violate;

- 1) “if an...order would infringe a Charter right, the Charter will apply to preclude the order”^{RWDSU}
- 2) “good faith does not mean .. **punishing a person for exercising an unchallengeable right**”^{Freeman}
- 3) “good faith ..does not mean **arbitrarily and illegally** .. divest a citizen of ..civil status”^{Freeman}
- 4) there was no court proceeding, therefore common law judicial immunity cannot apply,
- 5) the receiving of s504 information is a “ministerial act”^{McHale, Olumide} , it is not a judicial act,
- 6) “power of the courts to control their own administration was not absolute”^{Gonzalez}
- 7) the power to order an arrest and assault is not an adjudicative or core judicial duty,
- 8) lack of jurisdiction to change s10 Ontario Interpretation Act,
- 9) lack of jurisdiction to change s3 s17(3) Justice of Peace Officers Act,
- 10) lack of jurisdiction to change s81b Police Services Act
- 11) lack of jurisdiction to change / positive obligation to comply with s1 Human Rights Code
- 12) lack of Ontario jurisdiction to change Constitution Acts 1867 to 1982 52(1) “Any law inconsistent with .. Constitution is, to extent of the inconsistency, of no force or effect”
- 13) lack of Ontario jurisdiction to change Constitution Acts 1867 to 1982 Legislative Authority of Parliament of Canada 91 ‘Criminal Law... including the **Procedure in Criminal Matters**”
- 14) lack of Ontario jurisdiction to change Criminal Code s2, s482(1)(3), s507.1, s504, s540, s551.2, s551.3(1g Charter), s683(2), s802(1), s21b party to offence, s22 person counselling, s22.2 organization party to offence, s25.1(9)(11b) public officer offence, s122 breach of trust, s139 obstruction of justice, s140(1b) inducing police to commit a crime by lying that a black male is a security risk, s265(1a,b)(3c,d) assault, s346(1.1b) extortion, s380(1a) fraud, s341 fraudulent concealment, s423.1(b) intimidation,
- 15) lack of Ontario jurisdiction to change s2 objects, 6, 9, 10, 16 Canada Victims Bill of Rights,
- 16) lack of Ontario jurisdiction to change s11 s12 s13 s21(a,d) s34 Canada Interpretation Act,
- 17) lack of Ontario jurisdiction / positive obligation to obey s2, s3, s5 Canada Human Rights Act
- 18) lack of Ontario jurisdiction / positive obligation to comply with preamble objects s7 s9 s10 s12 s15 Charter of Rights, preamble objects,
- 19) lack of Ontario jurisdiction / positive obligation to comply with preamble objects s1(a,b,e), s2(a,b,c,e) Canada Bill of Rights against racist revictimization of victim with mens rae to retain proceeds^{Garland} of racism principle of fundamental justice,
- 20) lack of Ontario jurisdiction / positive obligation to comply with rule of law that vested inalienable right to equal protection from racist arrest, assault and extortion cannot be destroyed by government legislation,
- 21) lack of Ontario jurisdiction / positive obligation to comply with rule of law against arbitrary (contrary to objects of enabling Act) application of statutory power,
- 22) lack of Ontario jurisdiction / positive obligation to comply with rule of law against elevating alleged statutory power above the constitution,
- 23) lack of Ontario jurisdiction / positive obligation to comply with rule of law against using statutory public power in bad faith (discrimination, arrest, assault, extortion),
- 24) lack of Ontario jurisdiction / positive obligation to comply with rule of law against absurd statutory or constitutional interpretation,

Breached s362(1) Criminal Code; Para 2 of July 5 decision re Lise Maissonneuve “remedies ... are outside the jurisdiction of the council”

Para 8 of June 20 decision re Lise Maissonneuve “remedies you seek are outside the jurisdiction of the Council”

Para 2 of July 5 decision re Lise Maissonneuve “no evidence of judicial misconduct”

Para 5 of June 20 decision re Lise Maissonneuve “it was not misconduct for a judge to decline to take action to intervene in a court matter”

Para 7 of June 20 decision re Lise Maissonneuve “did not reveal any evidence of judicial misconduct”

These statements are false because any criminal code offence is “(ii) conduct that is incompatible with the due execution of his or her office, or (iii) failure to perform the duties of his or her office” AND Chief Justice Lise Maissonneuve violated Criminal Code s21b s22.2, s23, 25.1(9)(11b), by not responding to positive obligation re Criminal Code s507.1(10), 788, Justice of Peace Act 15(1)(4), Courts Justice Act 36(1) “The **Chief Justice** of the Ontario Court of Justice shall direct and supervise the sittings of the Ontario Court of Justice and the assignment of its judicial duties” by directing the regional senior judge to implement; “Criminal Code 507.1 (10) *designated justice* means a justice designated for the purpose **by the chief judge of the provincial court**” “788... justice may ..(2)(c) do all other things preliminary to the trial.” “15(1) The regional senior judge, under the **direction of the Chief Justice** of the Ontario Court of Justice, shall direct and supervise the sittings ... assignment of their judicial duties,” “Transfer to a judge (4) In the case of a trial that would otherwise be held before a justice of the peace, **any party** may submit a request to the regional senior judge of the Ontario Court of Justice for the region to have the trial held before a judge...” AND this inaction was intended to create the foreseeable consequence of JPs acting without jurisdiction to defraud Criminal Code s482 s504 s507.1 s507.1(7) s540 s551.2 s551.3(1g Charter) s683(2) s788 s802 sitting before a judge so as to facilitate ongoing crimes, therefore 16-30604 against Canadian Judicial Council is still seating in limbo.

Breached s22 Criminal Code; Last paragraph June 20 decision “**Will Appear In ...Annual Report**”

Para 4 of June 20 decision re Lise Maissonneuve “you have been declared a vexatious litigant” These statements are with intent to use the proceeds of fraud to incite JPs to act without jurisdiction to defraud Criminal Code s2 s482 s504 s507.1 s540 s551.2 s551.3(1g Charter) 683(2) s788 s802 WITH mens rae to protect Justice of Peace Review Council, Ontario Court of Justice, Ontario Judicial Council from criminal prosecution which is s122 Criminal Code breach of trust for personal benefit.

Defrauding s80 Courts Justice Act; Despite s3,7, 11 Justice of Peace Act involvement of the Chief Justice and a couple of letters requesting recusal due to conflict of interest, the Ontario Court of Justice, Lise Maissonneuve refused to confirm that she was not involved in the Justice of Peace Review Council registrar decision not to send new evidence of a police investigation of a court for defrauding s2 s482 s504 s507.1 s540 s551.2 s551.3(1g Charter) 683(2) s788 s802 to complaints committee.

- a) Courts Justice Act 80 Every judge or officer of a court in Ontario, ... I will faithfully, impartially and to the best of my skill and knowledge execute the duties of .. So help me God.
- b) Justice of Peace Act Composition (3) The Review Council is composed of, (a) the **Chief Justice of the Ontario Court of Justice**, or another judge of the Ontario Court of Justice designated by the Chief Justice; ... Chair (7) The **Chief Justice of the Ontario Court of Justice** or, in his or her absence, the Associate Chief Justice Co-ordinator of Justices of the Peace, shall chair all meetings of the Review Council. ...

All of which respectfully submitted by Ade Olumide