

File number E-201709210901573225 To; Office of the Independent Police Review Director
655 Bay Street, 10th Floor Toronto, Ontario, Tel : 416-246-7071, Fax: 416-327-8332 OIPRD@ontario.ca

CC: J.V.N. (Vince) Hawkes OPP Commissioner, 777 Memorial Avenue Orillia, Ontario, Canada, L3V 7V3,
Phone: 705 329-6111 Fax 705-330-4106, 705-326-4126 ... CC: Deputy Commissioner Rick Barnum, Toronto
Ottawa multi-jurisdictional criminal investigations, Organized Crime Enforcement Bureau

CC: Hon. Marie-France Lalonde, Minister Office (Community Safety and Correctional Services), Tel: 416-326-
2480, Fax: 416-325-6067 marie-france.lalonde@ontario.ca CC: Matthew Torigian, Deputy Minister-Community
Safety Tel: 416-326-5060, matt.torigian@ontario.ca CC: Sam Erry, Deputy Minister-Correctional Services Tel
416-327-9734, sam.erry@ontario.ca

From; Complainant: Ade Olumide, Tel 613 265 6360, fax 613 832 2051, email ade6035@gmail.com, .,
Dunrobin, ON, K0A 1T0
February 12, 2018

RECONSIDERATION REQUEST FOR DECISION DATED FEBRUARY 9, 2018

The only substantially honest implied statement in your letter, is that unlike other criminals before you, criminal code judicial immunity does not appear in your letter, this substantial omission is an admission that neither Canadian Judicial Council nor Ontario Justice of Peace Review Council nor Ontario nor Ontario Superior Court nor Ontario Court of Appeal nor Office Of The Independent Police Review Director nor Ontario Provincial Police has immunity from criminal prosecution or arrest for fraudulent purpose, assault, extortion, obstruction of justice, fraud.

Your letter refers to 900 pages, which is only 10% of available irrefutable evidence that every allegation is provably true, obviously the reason for 900 pages is that in a criminal prosecution of OIPRD I have to prove beyond all reasonable doubt that based on the 900 pages, the OIPRD was fully aware of the crimes, but chose to deliberately act without s60 Police Services Act Rule 6.4 OIPRD Rules Of Procedure jurisdiction, to violate s52(1) Constitution Acts 1867 to 1982 "Any law inconsistent with .. Constitution is, to extent of the inconsistency, of no force or effect" rule of law against using public power to contravene the objects of the enabling Act in order to assist OIPRD employer escape liability from the ongoing crime of defrauding of s140 Courts Justice Act constitutional question, thereby defrauding access to court for a judicial review of OIPRD s362, s21b, s341 s380 offences.

RECONSIDERATION REQUEST FOR S362 CRIMINAL CODE OFFENCES

Between 26th Day of February 2017 to 9th Day of February 2018 at the City of Toronto, OIPRD, did for a fraudulent purpose make a false statement in writing that "interaction with an unknown male officer ... there is no conduct issue", with intent that it be relied upon to defraud property (outcome of s7 Canada Victims Bill of Rights to outcome of criminal investigation of against JP Herb Kreling for s21b party to Canadian Judicial Council offences, s25.1(9)(11b) public officer offences, s139(1)(2)(3a) obstruction of justice s341 fraudulent concealment, s346(1.1b) extortion of JP Blaudveldt process against Canadian Judicial Council, s140(1b) inducing Ottawa Police to commit s265(1a,b)(3c,d) assault and s423.1(b) intimidation), in contravention of s362(1c) of the Criminal Code of Canada.

Between 26th Day of February 2017 to 9th Day of February 2018 at the City of Toronto, OIPRD, did for a fraudulent purpose make a false statement in writing that "does not present any information that indicates... misconduct", with intent that it be relied upon to defraud property (Criminal Code s21b, s22.2, s25.1(9)(11b), s341, s380(1a) conduct complaint against OPP Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner), in contravention of s362(1c) of the Criminal Code of Canada.

Between 26th Day of February 2017 to 9th Day of February 2018 at the City of Toronto, OIPRD, did for a fraudulent purpose make a false statement in writing that “only means of review for this decision is a judicial review”, with intent that it be relied upon to defraud property (Criminal Code s504 s507.1 right to prosecute OIPRD for s21b party to arrest for fraudulent purpose, assault, extortion, obstruction of justice, fraud by Ottawa Police / Ontario Provincial Police), in contravention of s362(1c) Criminal Code.

RECONSIDERATION REQUEST FOR S21b CRIMINAL CODE OFFENCES

Between 26th Day of February 2017 to 9th Day of February 2018 at the City of Toronto, OIPRD, did for a fraudulent concealment purpose wit s21b Criminal Code conduct complaint against OPP / s16 Canada Victims Bill of Rights to restitution of criminal court hearing date by misleading half-truth “failure to respond .. violation of Police Services Act, Charter of Rights and Freedom, Human Rights Code” without mention of the s7 Canada Victims Bill of Rights to outcome of OPP criminal investigation of arrest for fraudulent purpose, extortion, obstruction of justice, fraud by the Ontario Court of Justice, Justice of Peace Review Council / Ontario Superior Court and Ontario Court of Appeal defrauding access to a criminal court hearing date, in contravention of s21b of the Criminal Code of Canada.

Between 26th Day of February 2017 to 9th Day of February 2018 at the City of Toronto, OIPRD, did for a fraudulent purpose wit s60 Police Services Act Rule 6.4 OIPRD Rules Of Procedure Constitutional Question s12 Charter / s2(b,e) Canada Bill of Rights against criminals' revictimization of victim with mens rae to retain proceeds of crime principle of fundamental justice same grounds in the s140 Courts Justice Act constitutional question and wrote “decision not to proceed.. forwarded to ..Corrections Services” in order to assist OIPRD employer, Ontario Superior Court, Ontario Court of Appeal escape liabilities from ongoing theft of s24 Charter right to the s140 Courts Justice Act constitutional question by lying about s6(2) Courts Justice Act jurisdiction thereby defrauding judicial review of OIPRD s362, s21b, s341 s380 offences, in contravention of s21b of the Criminal Code of Canada.

RECONSIDERATION REQUEST FOR S380 CRIMINAL CODE OFFENCES

Between 26th Day of February 2017 to 9th Day of February 2018 at the City of Toronto, OIPRD, did knowingly by deceit, falsehood and other fraudulent means, defraud property (s60 Police Services Act Rule 6.4 OIPRD Rules Of Procedure Constitutional Question / s7 s9 s10 s16 Canada Victims Bill of Rights Policy Complaint / s21b Criminal Code party to arrest for fraudulent purpose, assault, extortion, obstruction of justice, fraud conduct complaint against OPP and Ottawa Police), in contravention of s380(1a) of the Criminal Code of Canada.

With respect, I hereby request reconsideration of your decision or reasons why the OIPRD is not guilty of the above mentioned criminal offences. It might seem politically expedient to side with criminals, but in the end I will succeed in defeating ALL criminals, the tables will turn suddenly and history will be unkind to ALL public officers who are siding with street criminals to defraud their innocent victim.

If you cannot prove by applying the law to the facts that dismissing the application without a hearing is not a violation of s362, s21b, s341 s380 criminal code and you refuse to hear application on the merits, the mens rae test is met. Before this letter, beyond all reasonable doubt evidence could be challenged, now that you know exactly what the charges will be, you have a decision to make. I challenge you to reproduce these 6 offences word for word and defeat them by applying the law to facts.

CONSEQUENCE OF OIPRD PARTY TO EXTORTION OF S504 S507.1 PROSECUTION OF CANADIAN JUDICIAL COUNCIL MEANS A RECONSIDERATION REFUSAL MAKES OIPRD A UNINTENTIONAL RACIST OR A INTENTIONAL RACISM SYMPATHIZER

The ultimate consequence of protecting Canadian Judicial Council by facilitating JP Kreling arrest, assault, extortion, obstruction of justice re file 16-30604 which is still seating as an orphan at the Ontario Court of Justice is encouraging racism against black politicians through the intentional destruction of my political career. When the police do their job, the meeting with JP Blaudveldt would be restituted and the file 16-30604 prosecution of Canadian Judicial Council that she already agreed to, would proceed.

Open Letter To Supreme Court Registrar and Auditor General of Canada: Stop cuddling Conservative “party brass” racists / Canadian Judicial Council racism sympathizers
https://adeolumideonline.files.wordpress.com/2018/01/openletter_supremecourtregistrar_auditorgeneral_ofcanada.pdf

Brar and others v. B.C. Veterinary Medical Association and Osborne, 2015 BCHRT 151 (CanLII) [742] ..In this respect they have an obligation: ...to be aware of whether their practices, policies and programs are having an adverse impact or resulting in systemic discrimination vis-à-vis racialized persons or groups. It is not acceptable from a human rights perspective to choose to remain unaware of the potential existence of discrimination or harassment, to ignore or to fail to act to address human rights matters, whether or not a complaint has been made. An organization violates the Code where it **directly or indirectly, intentionally or unintentionally infringes the Code or does not directly infringe the Code but rather authorizes, condones, adopts or ratifies behaviour that is contrary to the Code.** In addition, there is a **human rights duty not to condone or further a discriminatory act that has already occurred. To do so would extend or continue the life of the initial discriminatory act. The obligation extends to those who become involved in a situation that involves a discriminatory act, who, while not the main actors, are drawn into the matter nevertheless, through contractual relations or otherwise....**

1) “Party Brass” is a direct quote from an email apology from the Ottawa Citizen reporter who ran the story that Olumide was running in the more ethnically diverse riding of Ottawa West Nepean while he was selling memberships in the more homogenous riding of Carleton Mississippi Mills. I did not ask him to name the source, but since PMO Deputy Chief of Staff and Campaign Manager Jenni Byrne had a leading role in the national campaign and candidate selection, therefore she should know who was responsible for planting the false story.

2) The use of black African immigrant ethnic origin stereotypes (fake degree, foreign residence skeletons, if length of time in the country is “long enough to understand our cultural values”, Party HQ planted media story) to remove me from the Conservative Party Nomination race is racism. The words in quotes is from the head of the Conservative Party Nomination Committee who is trying to tell me that he is no racist, he just wants to know if I can understand them. I foolishly did not react, thinking if I just play nice, they will like me enough to let me run. I also did not react because knew I had already won so there was no need to defend myself. I should have asked if I were a caucasian immigrant from the UK, will he ask the same question. I should have asked if I were a caucasian immigrant from the UK would you accuse me of fake degrees, I should have asked if I were a caucasian immigrant from the UK would you accuse me of foreign residence skeletons, I should have asked if I were a caucasian immigrant from

the UK, would you spread these ethnic origin stereotypes and expect people to believe it without evidence because of my colour and ethnic origin?

3) There were 4 candidates, all 3 were white, I was the only black person, even though I beat everyone 7 to 1 in memberships and I was the only one disqualified. The question Justice Trudel should be wondering is that one contestant was a millionaire business man, one was already elected in the riding as a school board trustee, one was a former PMO staffer, so why did a 98% caucasian 1,800 members prefer a black African immigrant who speaks with an accent? The answer is that caucasian seniors members preferred me over 3 other caucasian candidates because while at the Municipal Taxpayer Advocacy Group I convinced 37 cities across Ontario to pass a motion that hydro should be affordable and promised to make a Canadian Hydro free trade agreement priority 1.

4) Federal Court of Appeal **Justice Trudel A301-16** October 19, November 19, 2015 knowingly made false statements in writing that “during his oral submissions, Mr. Olumide, **for the first time, stated that race and ethnicity** were at the root of his case”, despite;

- I. “party brass” referral of dispute with caucasian comparator Allan Riddel to an arbitrary committee and refusal of Olumide’s request to refer Olumide dispute to an arbitrary committee,
- II. use of black african immigrant stereotypes fake degree, foreign residency skeletons allegations by former Conservative Party Executive Director and nomination committee member Dan Hilton at the Conservative Party nomination committee interview,
- III. allegedly neutral former Conservative Party Executive Director and nomination committee member Dan Hilton dog whistle politics speech to members on the day of the nomination vote that only the 3 caucasian candidates are suitable but did not state why the black candidate was unsuitable,
- IV. use of black african immigrant stereotype not enough time in country to understand our culture allegations by two members of the Conservative Party nomination committee,
- V. use of black african immigrant stereotype foreign residency skeletons allegations in an email by an allegedly neutral member of the Conservative Party nomination committee,
- VI. use of dog whistle politics by Conservative “Party Brass” who, since Olumide already won, communicated fears to many many people that if Olumide was allowed to win, they would lose the riding, there was no need to say reason for loose the riding fear, Olumide’s black skin was obvious,
- VII. there were 4 candidates, all 3 were caucasian, Olumide was the only black person, Olumide beat everyone 7 to 1 in memberships, suddenly the “Party Brass” disqualified Olumide without a reason,
- VIII. witness statement from people who heard the use of nomination committee allegations of fake degree and other ethnic origin stereotypes by Conservative Party agent Walter Pamic,

- IX. Conservative Party agent Walter Pamic argued to an Olumide supporter that since the candidate in Ottawa West Nepean was black, Olumide did not experience racial discrimination,
- X. well-meaning member email advising Olumide that due to Conservative Party Brass fear of loss of the riding, he should to run in the more ethnically diverse riding of Ottawa West Nepean,
- XI. despite Olumide's overwhelming support with rural residents, Olumide was endorsed by rural residents that include the President of the Ontario landowners and a many farmers and members of farming associations that live and operate farms in the riding, a well-meaning member tried to explain Party's fears by asking Olumide how he would relate to farmers in the rural riding, **contrary to s362[1] of the Criminal Code.**

5) Federal Court of Appeal **Justice Trudel A301-16** October 19, November 19, 2015 knowingly made false statement in writing that "he presented a vague theory of premeditation ...plan to allowing him to run for the nomination as long as he did not win..there is **not an iota of evidence substantiating these serious allegations**", despite the following 2014 antecedence prior to May 2015 disqualification;

- I. Conservative "Party Brass" planted false 2014 story in Ottawa Citizen that Olumide was running in the ethnically diverse riding of Ottawa West Nepean while he was selling memberships in the more homogenous riding of Carleton Mississippi Mills,
- II. as occurred in another riding, the Conservative "Party Brass" could have informally disqualified Olumide anytime in 2014 but left him in the race while shopping for a caucasian to defeat him,
- III. Conservative "Party Brass" 2014 email to riding, asking that they not to buy memberships through Olumide because it may not be processed (though Olumide not named, he was the only one selling),
- IV. allegedly neutral head of Conservative Party nomination committee asking members during a dinner in 2014 not to buy memberships through Olumide because it may not be processed (though Olumide not named, he was the only one selling),
- V. allegedly neutral Conservative Party nomination committee member telling Olumide in 2014 that he has not been approved so he should stop telling people that he is seeking the nomination,
- VI. Conservative "Party Brass" 2014 efforts to draft Councillor Allan Hubley for fear that a black candidate had already won the nomination,
- VII. even people not supporting Olumide knew he had won, this triggered "Party Brass" plan B to ensure anyone but the black candidate would be allowed to contest the nomination in the safe riding; upon deciding not to contest the nomination, Councillor Hubley told Olumide in 2014 that "if the nomination were held today, you will win", the campaign manager for one of the contestants told Olumide in 2015 that "your name is the only name I am hearing at the door, you have succeeded in making the hydro free trade issue the ballot question", upon delivery of memberships days before Olumide was disqualified in May 2015 the Conservative Party staffer that received the memberships told Olumide that he has beaten everyone else "hands down" ,

- VIII. dog whistle politics stump speech of Conservative Party agent Walter Pamic telling many many many members that he has been drafted into the race because the Conservative Party is scared that we would loose the riding, everyone knew Olumide had already won, there was no need to say the reason for the loose the riding fear, my black skin colour was obvious,
- IX. At a time when only Conservative “Party Brass” current Executive Director Dustin Van Vught knew about the threat of litigation, Conservative Party agent Walter Pamic immediately received that insider information and worked through a mutual friend to try to convince Olumide to back down, when that did not work Conservative Party agent Walter Pamic began spreading ethnic origin stereotype rumours based on accurate insider information of the same ethnic origin stereotype allegations from Conservative Party nomination interview documents that he was not privy to, **contrary to s362(1) of the Criminal Code.**
- 6) The heart of the matter is not Justice Trudel’s deliberate false statements, but her inner racism sympathizer motive for inserting those racism false statements. Her order is laced with indignation that the black boy does not know his place. She already lied about lack of jurisdiction over the Constitutional Question re; Canada Elections Act, Human Rights Act, Employment Equity Act, Public Service Employment Act, Personal Information Protection And Electronic Documents Act, she could have stopped there, instead she pretended that there the Conservative Party had a single iota of defence to irrefutable racism facts, pretended there was a trial and made unnecessary demonstrably false no racism finding of fact in order to cuddle and encourage Conservative “Party Brass” racism.
- 7) Federal Court of Appeal Justice Johane Trudel wanted to kill the racism facts, so that some racists in the Conservative “Party Brass” can overturn the will of the grassroots who do not care about my colour. The 98% caucasian members preferred the black boy over 3 other well accomplished caucasian candidates because without being elected, while at the Municipal Taxpayer Advocacy Group Olumide convinced 37 cities across Ontario to pass a motion that hydro should be affordable, so they knew they could trust him to use the same persuasive skills to make a Canadian Hydro free trade agreement priority 1.
- 8) Defrauding enclosed Judicial Notice Of Legislative Fact constitutional question is deliberate intent to facilitate racism against black politicians;
- a) The unconstitutional effect of s67(4c) Canada Elections Act Guergis / Pick / Grewal / Vriend cases law is; in nomination “process... established pursuant to a statute”, it is “statutorily allowed” to decide “fundamental purpose...endorsing one...of its members as candidates” Act by violating s3 s5 Human Rights Code / s15 s3 Charter right to representation in government ^{Figuera} through a racially discriminatory process that limits Canada / Ontario Elections Act employment opportunities;
- 9) *Figuroa v. Canada (Attorney General)*, 2003 SCC 37 (CanLII), 227 D.L.R. (4th) 1... the purpose of the right to vote enshrined in s. 3 of the Charter is not equality of voting power per se, but the right to “effective representation”. Ours is a representative democracy. **Each citizen is entitled to be represented in government.**

10) Pick v. Conservative Party of Canada, 2004 CanLII 38425 (SK QB) It is neither surprising nor offensive to the logic of the above candidate selection process that Article 3, subsection k of the **Candidate Nomination Rules and Procedures, as well as Section 67(4)(c) of the Act should be compatible with one another**. It makes no sense to me that an application for the position of a “nomination contestant” should have his application accepted in the first instance, proceed to the riding election and if duly elected, subsequently fail to receive the endorsement of the party under Section 67(4)(c)...

11) Vriend v. Alberta, [1998] 1 SCR 493, 1998 CanLII 816 (SCC) 2 66 ... submission has failed to distinguish between “private activity” and “**laws that regulate private activity**”. The former is not subject to the Charter, **while the latter obviously is**. ...to **wait until someone is discriminated against ...challenge the validity of the provision** in each appropriate case... would not only be wasteful of judicial resources, but also unfair in that it would impose burdens of delay, cost and personal vulnerability to discrimination for the individuals involved in those eventual cases.... provisions... **do not depend on any particular factual context in order to resolve their constitutional status**, there is really no need to adduce additional evidence...

12) Guergis v. Novak, 2013 ONCA449 “[90] Even if the allegation regarding the Prime Minister’s involvement is read as proven, s. 67(4)(c) of the Canada Elections Act, S.C. 2000 c.9, gives the leader of a political party the authority to refuse to endorse a candidate. **As it is statutorily allowed, it therefore cannot be an unlawful act**”...

13) Grewal v. Conservative Party of Canada, 2004 CanLII 9568 (ON SC) [29] I cannot accept the plaintiff’s position on the meaning of s. 67(4)(c) and the restrictive application of that section. [30] Firstly, there is nothing in that section that stipulates that a leader must give reasons for not endorsing a candidate. In any event, in this case **reasons were articulated and the plaintiff was advised of the reasons by the Interim Council**. [31] Secondly, the Party, determines the candidates he wishes to have representing the Party. It is not for the Court to make those determinations. The Court should not interfere with a process that has been established by a Party or a **process that has been established pursuant to a statute**..

14) Canada Elections Act (S.C. 2000, c. 9) Interpretation:

Definitions 2 (1) The definitions in this subsection apply in this Act.

a. Guidelines and interpretation notes 16.1 (1) The Chief Electoral Officer shall, in accordance with this section, issue guidelines and interpretation notes on the application of this Act — other than Division 1.1 of Part 16.1 — to registered parties, registered associations, **nomination contestants**, candidates and leadership contestants

b. election means an election of a member to serve in the House of Commons.

c. **nomination contest** means a competition for the selection of a person to be proposed to a registered party for its endorsement as its candidate in an electoral district.

d. **nomination contestant** means a person who is named as a nomination contestant under paragraph 476.1(1)(c) in a report filed in accordance with subsection 476.1(1) in respect of a nomination contest and who, or whose financial agent, has not yet complied with sections 476.75 to 476.94 in respect of that nomination contest.

e. political party means an organization one of whose **fundamental purposes** is to participate in public affairs by **endorsing one or more of its members as candidates** and supporting their election.

f. Witness files nomination paper 67 (1) The witness to the consent referred to in paragraph 66(1)(b) shall file the nomination paper with the returning officer in the electoral district in which the prospective candidate is seeking nomination at any time between the issue of the Notice of Election and the close of nominations....Other requirements (4) The witness shall file with the returning officer, together with the nomination paper,....(c) if applicable, an instrument in writing, signed by the person or persons authorized by the political party to endorse prospective candidates that states that the prospective candidate is endorsed by the party.

15) The mens rae of Chief Racism Sympathizer, Chief Justice of Supreme Court of Canada, Chair of Canadian Judicial Council Beverley McLachlin and root cause is the verbalized comment of Justice Roy “you should find something else to do with your life”. She made this comments because the Chair of Canadian Judicial Council has provided implied consent for racist remarks by Justices Trudel, Harrington, Salmers, Weilier, Hackland, Canadian Judicial Council Executive Director Norman Sabourin who despite contrary evidence, accused me of lying about racism. Canadian Judicial Council Executive Director Norman Sabourin, despite contrary evidence, also accused me of lying about racism.

16) These are s362 offence of false statements in writing with intent that it can be relied upon to defraud service. The alleged judges all have the same opinion “find something else to do with your life”. With respect, if all the judges in Canadian Judicial Council share this opinion, I will not agree, even if they threaten me with jail time or ask the police to shoot me. If I survive, on my hospital bed, I will continue to maintain my inalienable right to act in self-defence to racism sympathizers. Supreme Court Chief Justice McLachlin personally refused to withdraw the illegal service of a document to the Conservative Party in order to facilitate perjury and defraud my statutory right to bring a motion.”

17) Ontario Superior Court Justice Salmers lied that in comparison to white comparator Gary Mchale in R. v. McHale, 2010 ONCA 361 (CanLII) who was allowed to go after the OPP commissioner through s504 s507.1, AND Justice Hackland discrimination that english language deficiencies justifies fake degree / foreign residence discrimination falsehoods to prevent a homogenous riding from having a black candidate AND Hackland trial coordinator asking if this is a drug issue AND Chief Justice McLachlin encouraging discrimination by covering up D’Angelo perjured affidavit AND Chief Justice Strathy encouraging discrimination by covering up D’Angelo Notice of Appeal falsehood AND condescending laughter and taunts from crown counsel Brian Redman / JP Jocelyne A. St Jean AND arrest and assault by JP Kreling AND Ottawa Police use of 138(1)(ii) Police Services Act to breach s6(1)(4), s7(1)(3)(4) Police Services Act Ontario Regulation 58/16 because my colour is a security risk, “there is insufficient evidence that he has been discriminated against because he is black”, AND even though the Crown did not file any written submissions other than argue orally that Justice Hackland (lied) that Superior Court, Ontario Court of Appeal, Federal Court made civil orders that leave is required to bring a criminal court application against Superior Court, Ontario Court of Appeal, Federal Court, **Justice Salmers has evidence that this is how judges and JPs and crown counsel treated Gary McHale.**

18) The following 23 part legal test shows they are either racists or racism sympathizers;

19) Brar and others v. B.C. Veterinary Medical Association and Osborne, 2015 BCHRT 151

20) Discrimination is a distinction whether intentional or not, which has the effect of imposing disadvantages Para 693, limits benefits available to other members of society Para 693.

- a. Does falsely accusing Olumide of lying about racism impose a disadvantage or limit opportunities of other black politicians who win a nomination in a more homogenous riding?
- 21) Inclusion is achieved by preventing exclusion Para 694,
 a. Does falsely accusing Olumide of lying about racism promote inclusion of other black politicians who win a nomination in a more homogenous riding?
- 22) Prima facie individual discrimination Para 697,
 a. Do these caucasian judges who directly or indirectly falsely accused Olumide of lying about racism meet the test for prima facie discrimination?
- 23) It is not necessary to allege that discrimination was intentional. Para 699
 24) There is no need to establish an intention to discriminate, the focus of the enquiry is on the effect of the respondent's actions on the complainant. Para 708(b) "focus is on the effects of the respondent's actions, not the reasons..is given statutory effect in s. 2 of the Code..." Para 734
 a. Whether or not these judges intended to encourage discrimination against black politicians, is this outcome of falsely accusing Olumide of lying about racism foreseeable?
- 25) Discrimination need not be the only factor. Para 700
 a. If these judges have other criminal reasons for falsely accusing Olumide of lying about racism, are they still be guilty of encouraging discrimination against black politicians?
- 26) Just because other black people may not have faced similar treatment. Para 702.
 a. Just because Conservative "Party Brass" succeeded in finding another black candidate in Ottawa West Nepean, are these judges are entitled to falsely accuse Olumide of lying about racism?
- 27) Inference of discrimination may be drawn where the evidence, including circumstantial evidence, renders the inference more probable than other possible explanations. Para 703
 28) Look at all the circumstances to identify the "subtle scent of discrimination" Para 705
 29) There need not be direct evidence of discrimination, discrimination will more often be proven by the circumstantial evidence and inference. Para 708d
 30) Discrimination based on race is very subtle, direct evidence is rarely available. Para 715
 31) Peel Law Assn. v. Pieters, 2013 ONCA 396 (CanLII). In race cases, the outcome depends on the respondents' state of mind, which cannot be directly observed and must always be inferred from circumstantial evidence... Para 719
 32) Relatively "little affirmative evidence" is required before the inference of discrimination is permitted. .. standard of proof requires inference be more probable then not... Para 719
 33) The intersection of "place of origin" with race, colour or ethnic origin appears to compound the barriers to employment integration and intensify economic and social vulnerability for foreign educated and trained persons. Para 740
 a. The fact that if Olumide were a caucasian immigrant from the UK, no one would ask if he degrees are fake, no one would ask if he has foreign residency skeletons, no one would ask if he has been long enough in the country to understand our culture, no one would be scared of loosing the rising, is evidence that these judges falsely accused Olumide of lying about racism?
- 34) Historical disadvantage experienced by the group is a factor. Para 704

a. Should the historical disadvantage of black people be a factor that judges tempted to cuddle Conservative “Party Brass” racists should have taken into account?

35) Evidence that white people are treated better in similar circumstances. Para 707

a. Is the fact that the Conservative “Party Brass” referred the Allan Riddel matter to an arbitrary committee but refused Olumide request for referral to an arbitrary committee a factor that these judges should have taken into account before falsely accusing Olumide of lying about racism?

36) Organizations have a responsibility to take proactive steps to ensure that they are not engaging in, condoning or allowing racial discrimination or harassment to occur. Para 712

a. Does condoning and allowing racial discrimination by falsely accusing Olumide of lying about racism prove that; worst case scenario is that these judges are racists, best case scenario is that these judges are racism sympathizers?

37) Failing to recognize the complex, subtle and systemic nature of racism impedes effective action against it. Para 713

a. Is there any rational connection between accusing Olumide of lying about racism and the Correia legal test before them? *Correia v. York Catholic District School Board*, 2011 HRTO 1733 (CanLII) [75] Many discrimination cases, such as this case, do not involve direct evidence that a complainant’s colour or race was a factor in the incident in question. A tribunal must draw reasonable inferences from proven facts. [76]. . .:(a) The prohibited ground or grounds of discrimination need not be the sole or the major factor leading to the discriminatory conduct; it is sufficient if they are a factor; (b) There is no need to establish an intention or motivation to discriminate; the focus of the enquiry is the effect of the respondent’s actions on the complainant; (c) There need be no direct evidence of discrimination; discrimination will more often be proven by circumstantial evidence and inference; and (d) Racial stereotyping will usually be the result of subtle unconscious beliefs, biases and prejudices. . . [77] In cases where discrimination must be proved by circumstantial evidence,. . . (1) Once a prima facie case of discrimination has been established, the burden shifts to the respondent to provide a rational explanation which is not discriminatory. (2)... The respondent must offer an explanation which is credible on all the evidence. (3) A complainant is not required to establish that the respondent’s actions lead to no other conclusion but that discrimination was the basis for the decision at issue in a given case. (4) There is no requirement that the respondent’s conduct, to be found discriminatory, must be consistent with the allegation of discrimination and inconsistent with any other rational explanation. (5) The ultimate issue is whether an inference of discrimination is more probable from the evidence than the actual explanations offered by the respondent. ..34] .. a prima facie case of racial discrimination. **He was the only candidate ... who is a member of a racialized group. The successful candidates were all caucasian. The applicant fulfilled the basic qualifications for the position as advertised. ... His academic qualifications were superior to those of the successful candidates.** Given these facts, it is my view that the applicant has provided a sufficient basis at least to shift the evidentiary burden to the respondent and require it to provide an explanation for the decisions it made.

38) Individual acts themselves may be ambiguous or explained away, but as part of the larger picture, may lead to an inference that racial discrimination was a factor. Para 714

a. Since Justice Trudel already lied about lack of jurisdiction, what is the bigger picture motive of going beyond the jurisdiction question and accusing Olumide of lying about racism?

- 39) racialized people are less credible and must be more carefully scrutinized, investigated or must be corroborated... racialized people play the “race card” to manipulate; Para 724
- a. Judges know this stereotype, therefore each time a judge directly or indirectly accuses Olumide of lying about racism without applying the legal test to the facts, is it not obvious that they are deliberately encouraging the stereotype that black people lie about racism?
- 40) racialized people themselves, and not racism or racial discrimination, are at fault for their disadvantage or state of “otherness,” commonly known as “blaming it on the victim”; Para 724
- a. Is this why Justice Hackland and Canadian Judicial Council Executive Director Norman Sabourin blamed the victim by alleging english language deficiencies (whether or not Olumide has english language deficiencies, no judge can claim not to understand his allegations) ?
- 41) Tribunal has found that the lack of due process may be evidence of adverse treatment. Para 732
- a. Despite due process trite law that a court cannot make findings of fact without trial evidence, is accusing Olumide of lying about racism without trial evidence, irrefutable proof that these judges deliberately intended to profit from the stereotype that black people lie about racism?
- 42) How events would normally unfold in a given situation; if there are differences in the normal practice, this might provide evidence of differential treatment. Para 733 Complainants should not be required to prove they are worse off than others and that a ‘race to the bottom’ type analysis must be avoided Para 762 The Code does not require an intention to discriminate in order to establish a contravention of the Code; the focus is on the impact of the policy. Para 735
- a. It is unconstitutional to deny a candidate without a reason, it does not have to be a good reason or a bad reason, but the Conservative Party Brass racists must give a reason, therefore Olumide is entitled to a hearing of the s67(4c) s91 s504 Canada Elections Act constitutional question, since the judges cannot point to any other case in Canadian history where a candidate was disqualified without providing the candidate a reason, how can they justify lying about jurisdiction?
- 43) As a result of overwhelming evidence of the following irrefutable facts, the Supreme Court Registrar Roger Bilodeau lacks the jurisdiction to breach the rule of law against using public power in bad faith act in bad faith by doing indirectly (using unconstitutional legislation) what cannot be done directly, with intent to cuddle Conservative “Party Brass” racists / Canadian Judicial Council racism sympathizer;
- 44) Canadian Judicial Council refusing to create a record of investigation re enclosed A301-16 fraud by Federal Court of Appeal Justice Trudel in order to help Conservative “Party Brass” racists.
- 45) In 2016 the Ontario Court of Appeal lied that they lack C61130 jurisdiction to hear appeal of Superior Court Justice Hackland’s final order preventing me from being the 2015 general elections candidate. The Conservative Party lawyer Paul D’Angelo did not know that the Ontario Court of Appeal were so skilled in lying, so he lied that he did not receive the Notice of Appeal, racism sympathizer Ontario Court of Appeal Chief Justice George Strathy protected D’Angelo by refusing to adjudicate the motion relief. Despite transcript evidence of Justice Hackland clearly making an abuse of process final decision to block Olumide from the 2015 election and use of security in costs to encourage racism, the Ontario Court of Appeal chose to cuddle Conservative “Party Brass” racists by lying about jurisdiction.

- 46) In C61130 the Chief Racism Sympathizer former Supreme Court Chief Justice Beverley McLachlin covered up racism sympathizer Federal Court of Appeal Justice Anne Mactavish / Conservative “Party Brass” racists’ lawyer Paul D’Angelo use of a perjured affidavit to steal A301-16 costs won by racism sympathizer Federal Court of Appeal Justice Johane Trudel fraud, by mooted the Supreme Court motion by refusing to withdraw an illegal Supreme Court service to the Conservative Party.
- 47) The Chief Racism Sympathizer former Canadian Judicial Chair Beverley McLachlin defrauded A367-16 proceeding against racism sympathizer Canadian Judicial Council / Conservative “Party Brass” racists by falsely stating that the Supreme Court lacks jurisdiction to hear the appeal of racism sympathizer Federal Court of Appeal Justice David Stratas final order in A367-16 who within the orders asked the registrar to prevent the only other 2 options (single judge reconsideration motion or Federal Court of Appeal panel motion for leave to appeal to the Supreme Court motion).
- 48) The Chief Racism Sympathizer former Canadian Judicial Chair Beverley McLachlin defrauded A313-16 proceeding against the Conservative “Party Brass” racists by falsely stating that the Supreme Court lacks jurisdiction to hear the appeal of racism sympathizer Federal Court of Appeal Justice David Stratas final order in A313-16 who within the orders asked the registrar to prevent the only other 2 options (single judge reconsideration motion or Federal Court of Appeal panel motion for leave to appeal to the Supreme Court motion).
- 49) The Chief Racism Sympathizer former Supreme Court Chief Justice Beverley McLachlin defrauded T1640-16 proceeding against the racism sympathizer Supreme Court / Conservative “Party Brass” racists by falsely stating that the Supreme Court lacks jurisdiction to hear the appeal of racism sympathizer Federal Court of Appeal Justice Denis Pelletier written final judgement / racism sympathizer Federal Court of Appeal Justice David Stratas verbal judgement confirming the written final judgement in T1640-16 refusing to comply with s27 Federal Courts Act right to appeal Federal Court Chief Justice Paul Crampton verbal “final judgement” refusal to overturn Federal Court registrar written “final judgement” removing the scheduled T1640-16 motion from the rolls. Federal Courts Act “final judgment means any judgment or other decision that determines in whole or in part any substantive right of any of the parties in controversy in any judicial proceeding”.

All of which respectfully submitted by complainant in person Ade Olumide