

**OPEN LETTER TO CALGARY POLICE CHIEF ROGER CHAFFIN;
Request To Stop Calgary Police From Sending Unsigned Letter Threat Of
Injury With Mental Intent To Extort Police Act Rights To Calgary Police
Service Complaint Decision / Calgary Police Policy Complaint Decision**

TO: Calgary Police Chief, Chief Constable Roger Chaffin, rchaffin@calgarypolice.ca
Tel; 403-428-5900 Fax: 403-265-9870 PSS@calgarypolice.ca
5111 47 St. N.E.Calgary, Alberta, Canada T3J 3R2 Police Chief Fax 403 428 4552

CC: A/Staff Sgt Hayley Marquis #4568, General Investigations Unit, Team 1 – Districts 1 & 4, Calgary Police Service, Main Phone: 403-428-6400 Desk Phone 403-428-6413
Email: pol4568@calgarypolice.ca; HMarquis@calgarypolice.ca

CC: Keith Cain, Inspector, Tel 403 266 1234, kcain@calgarypolice.ca; Barry E. Davis #10187, Calgary Police Service, Professional Standards Section, Citizen Complaint Unit , (403) 428-8177 (Direct)
BDavis@calgarypolice.ca

CC: Calgary Police Commission: c/o Brian Thiessen, Chair, nsuffron@calgarypolicecommission.ca
Rocky Mountain Plaza, 650 – 615 MacLeod Trail SE Calgary, AB T2G 4T8
Phone 403.428.8914, Fax 403.261.4605 cpcpcd@calgarypolicecommission.ca

CC: Calgary City Council c/o Mayor Naheed Nenshi
Office of the Mayor, The City of Calgary, P.O. Box 2100, Station M Calgary, AB, T2P 2M5
Phone: 403-268-5622 Fax: 403-268-8130 Direct Email: themayor@calgary.ca

CC: Premier Hon. Rachel Notley, premier@gov.ab.ca; premier.notley@gov.ab.ca; 307 Legislature Building 10800 - 97 Avenue, Edmonton, AB T5K 2B6; Phone: 780.427.2251 Fax: 780.427.1349
Constituency Office, Strathcona Professional Centre, Suite 101, 10328 - 81 Avenue NW Edmonton, AB, Canada T6E 1X2 Phone: 780.414.0702 Fax: 780.414.0703 Email: edmonton.strathcona@assembly.ab.ca

CC: UCP Party Leader, Mr. Jason Kenney, (UCP) Calgary-Lougheed, Constituency Office #311A, 2525 Woodview Drive SW Calgary, AB Canada T2W 4N4, Phone:403.238.1212 Fax:403.251.5453 Email: calgary.lougheed@assembly.ab.ca; Legislature Office 5th Floor 9820 - 107 Street Edmonton, AB Canada T5K 1E

CC: Dr. David Swann, MLA, Calgary Mountain View, Alberta Liberal Opposition, #102, 723 14 Street NW, Calgary, AB T2N 2A4, Email: Calgary.Mountainview@assembly.ab.ca Tel: 403.216.5445 Fax: 403.216.5447

CC: Solicitor General Hon. Kathleen Ganley, ministryofjustice@gov.ab.ca
424 Legislature Building 10800 - 97 Avenue, Edmonton, AB Canada T5K 2B6, Phone: 780.427.2339
Fax: 780.422.6621, Constituency Office #130, 1177 - 11 Avenue SW Calgary, AB, Canada T2R 1K9
Phone: 403.244.7737 Fax: 403.541.9106 Email: calgary.buffalo@assembly.ab.ca

CC: UCP Justice Critic, Mrs. Angela Pitt, (UCP) Airdrie, Email: airdrie@assembly.ab.ca, Legislature Office 5th Floor 9820 - 107 Street Edmonton, AB Canada T5K 1E7
Phone: 780.644.7121 Fax: 780.638.3506

CC: Philip Bryden, Deputy Minister of Justice and Deputy Solicitor General and Deputy Attorney General, 2nd fl Bowker Building, 9833 - 109 Street, Edmonton, AB T5K 2E8 Phone: 780 427-5032
E-mail: philip.bryden@gov.ab.ca

CC: Sarah Dafoe, Chief of Staff, Office of the Deputy Minister, Justice and Solicitor General and Deputy Attorney General, 2nd fl Bowker Building, 9833 - 109 Street, Edmonton, AB, T5K 2E8
Phone: 780 427-5032, E-mail: sarah.dafoe@gov.ab.ca

CC: W.M. (Bill) Sweeney, OOM, Assistant Deputy Minister, Director of Law Enforcement, Marie Anne Olson for Bill Sweeney, Executive Assistant to the Assistant Deputy Minister, Public Security Division, Phone: 780-427-6789, Fax: 780-427-1194, Email: Marieanne.olson@gov.ab.ca

CC: David Loukadelis, Board Chair, david.loukidelis@gov.ab.ca; Law Enforcement Review Board c/o Diana Richardson, Associate Secretary, Law Enforcement Review Board, Telephone: (780) 422-9376, Fax: (780) 422-4782, lerb@gov.ab.ca

CC: Acting Chair Ellen-Anne O'Donnell, Criminal Injuries Review Board, cirb@gov.ab.ca c/o Heather Spicer, Calgary Police Commission, Public Complaint Director, 1502, 10025 – 102A Avenue NW, Edmonton, AB T5J 2Z2, Phone: 780-427-7330 Fax: 780-427-7347

CC: Julie Peacock, Director Victims Services, Policy and Program Development Branch
10th Floor North, John E Brownlee Building, 10365 -97 Street NW, Edmonton, Alberta, T5J 3W7
Telephone 780 427 3457 Fax 780 422 4213, Julie.Peacock@gov.ab.ca

From Complainant: Ade Olumide, Tel 613 265 6360, fax 613 832 2051, email ade6035@gmail.com, .

March 18, 2018

On February 19, 2018, I received by courier an unsigned letter dated February 13, 2018 from the Calgary Police making threats of injury “further measures against you will be considered”. This as a threat to come to my home to assault, arrest and charge me for s140(1,a,b,c) Criminal Code. To my knowledge, this is the only “further measure” that is available to the Calgary Police. **Consequently please accept this as a formal request to charge the Calgary Police for 5 criminal offences;**

PUBLIC MISCHIEF

1) Charge the Calgary police for violating s140(1,b) Criminal Code “divert suspicion from himself”

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;

THREATS OF INJURY

2) Charge the Calgary police for violating s346(1.1)(b) extortion, s423.1(b) intimidation Criminal Code through threats of injury in order to extort statutory right to a Sgt Hayley misconduct complaint decision and an s7 Canada Victims Bill of Rights policy decision.

MOTIVE FOR THREATS OF INJURY; EXTORTING SERVICE COMPLAINT DECISION

3) Charge the Calgary Police for violating s380(1) Criminal Code “deceit, falsehood and other fraudulent means” defrauding Police Service Regulation 5(1e "discreditable conduct", h "neglect of duty), Police Act 42.1, 44(11), 43(12)(b)(ii), 44(4)(5), 45, 47(4)(5), 48(2), oath by acting without s7 s9 s10 s12 s15 s24 Charter of Rights, s1(a,b,e), s2(a,b,c,e) Canada Bill of Rights, s2 objects s6 s7 s9 s10 s16 Canada Victims Bill of Rights jurisdiction and in bad faith by refusing to issue a decision and stating “will no longer accept correspondence from you”, through reliance on deliberate falsehoods that complaints against Sgt Hayley for refusing to comply with s7 Canada Victims Bill of Rights by disclosing which of the 4 elements of extortion offence against Alberta Provincial Court was not met, is not a misconduct complaint, with mens rae to facilitate obstruction of justice, assault, extortion of s2 “prosecutor” s504 s507.1 s551.3(1g Charter) Criminal Code right to prosecute Canadian Judicial Council member Alberta Court of Queen’s Bench for party to tax fraud.

MOTIVE FOR THREATS OF INJURY; EXTORTING POLICY COMPLAINT DECISION

4) Charge the Calgary Police for violating s380(1) Criminal Code “deceit, falsehood and other fraudulent means” defrauding Police Act 42.1, 44(11), 43(12)(b)(ii), 44(4)(5), 45, 47(4)(5), 48(2), oath by acting without s7 s9 s10 s12 s15 s24 Charter of Rights, s1(a,b,e), s2(a,b,c,e) Canada Bill of Rights, s2 objects s6 s7 s9 s10 s16 Canada Victims Bill of Rights jurisdiction and in bad faith by refusing to issue a decision and stating “will no longer accept correspondence from you”, through ongoing reliance on deliberate falsehoods that policy complaints re lack of Calgary Police jurisdiction to refuse to create a policy that s7 Canada Victims Bill of Rights is a right to on request, disclose to the victim the outcome of each element of the offence in a criminal investigation, is not a policy complaint, with mens rae to facilitate obstruction of justice, assault, extortion of s2 “prosecutor” s504 s507.1 s551.3(1g Charter) Criminal Code right to prosecute Canadian Judicial Council member Alberta Court of Queen’s Bench for party to tax fraud.

POLICE ACT

Definitions1 In this Act, (d) “complainant” means a person who makes a complaint under section 42.1; (d.1) “complaint” means a complaint under section 42.1;

Complaints 42.1(1) Subject to subsection (2), a person may make a complaint respecting the conduct of a police officer. (2) The following persons may make a complaint referred to in subsection (1):

(a) a person to whom the conduct complained of was directed;

(3) Any person may make a complaint in respect of a policy or service of a police service.

(4) A complaint must be made in writing and must include the following information:

(a) the full name of the complainant;

(b) the complainant’s contact information, including the complainant’s (i) address, (ii) telephone number, (iii) cellular telephone number, if available, and (iv) electronic mail address, if available;

(d) if the complaint is in respect of the conduct of a police officer,

(i) the date of the alleged conduct, if known, (ii) the identification of the police officer, if known, and

- (iii) a description of the incident that gave rise to the alleged conduct;
 - (e) if the complaint is in respect of a policy or service of a police service, sufficient information to identify the policy or service complained of;
 - (g) any other information prescribed in the regulations.
- (5) A complaint may be transmitted by electronic mail.
- (6) A complaint is considered to be made on the date it is received by the chief of police, the officer in charge of a police service, the Public Complaint Director, the Regional Public Complaint Director or the Provincial Public Complaint Director, as the case may be.

Bringing of complaints 43(1) All complaints with respect to a police service or a police officer, other than the chief of police, shall be referred to the chief.

(4) On receipt of a complaint under subsection (1), the chief of police shall determine whether the complaint or a portion of the complaint is a complaint as to (a) the policies of or the services provided by the police service, or (b) the actions of a police officer.

(5) A complaint or that portion of the complaint that is a complaint (a) as to the policies of or services provided by the police service shall be disposed of in accordance with section 44, and (b) as to the actions of a police officer shall be disposed of in accordance with sections 45 to 48.

Complaints re policies and services 44(1) Where a complaint is a complaint as to the policies of or services provided by a police service, the chief of police shall review the matter, and

(a) take whatever action the chief considers appropriate, if any, or

(b) refer the matter to the commission for it to take whatever action it considers appropriate.

(2) On the disposition of a matter by the chief of police or the commission under subsection (1), the chief shall advise the complainant in writing (a) as to the disposition of the matter in respect of which the complaint was made, and (b) of the complainant's right to appeal the matter to the commission if the complainant is not satisfied with the disposition of the matter.

(11) The chief of police, in the case of a complaint under this section, must advise the complainant in writing at least once every 45 days as to the status of the complaint.

Complaints re police officers 45(0.1) ..

(1) Where a complaint is a complaint as to the actions of a police officer other than the chief of police, subject to sections 43 and 43.1, the chief shall cause the complaint to be investigated.

(2) If, after causing the complaint to be investigated, the chief of police is of the opinion that the actions of a police officer may constitute (a) an offence under an Act of the Parliament of Canada or the Legislature of Alberta, the chief shall refer the matter to the Minister of Justice and Solicitor General, or (b) a contravention of the regulations governing the discipline or the performance of duty of police officers, the chief shall cause the matter to be proceeded with under subsection (3).

(3) Where the chief of police is of the opinion that the actions of a police officer constitute a contravention of the regulations governing the discipline or the performance of duty of police officers, the chief of police, or a person designated by the chief of police who, pursuant to the regulations, is eligible to serve as the presiding officer at a hearing, shall conduct a hearing into the matter as it relates to that contravention. (7) If a complaint is being investigated under this section, the chief of police must advise the complainant in writing at least once every 45 days as to the progress of the investigation.

MOTIVE FOR THREATS OF INJURY; FRAUDULENT CONCEALMENT

5) Charge the Calgary Police for violating s341 Criminal Code fraudulent concealment by defrauding Police Act 42.1, 44(11), 43(12)(b)(ii), 44(4)(5), 45, 47(4)(5), 48(2), oath by acting without s7 s9 s10 s12 s15 s24 Charter of Rights, s1(a,b,e) s2(a,b,c,e) Canada Bill of Rights, s2 objects s6 s7 s9 s10 s16 Canada Victims Bill of Rights jurisdiction and in bad faith by refusing to issue misconduct and policy complaint decisions and stating “will no longer accept correspondence from you”, through a new falsehood that the Alberta Provincial Court proceeds of crime extorted of right to prosecute Canadian Judicial Council (Alberta Court of Queen’s Bench) refusal to request investigation of criminal misconduct by Justice Stratias (Ontario order referred to in the letter), is jurisdiction to lie that a Sgt Hayley misconduct complaint is not a misconduct complaint AND lie that an s7 policy complaint is not a policy complaint, with mens rae to facilitate these Canadian Judicial Council s21b Judges Act crimes;

STRATAS CRIMINAL MISCONDUCT COMPLAINT WHICH CANADIAN JUDICIAL COUNCIL MEMBER ALBERTA COURT OF QUEEN’S BENCH RECEIVED IN ALBERTA

1. false statement in writing that appeals have “**little chance of success**” **despite fact that no relief / grounds in any notice of appeal have been reproduced in any order and defeated by applying case law to the facts**, and despite fact that if the appeals truly had little chance of success, it is easier for the Court to hear them on merits, than commit over 180 counts of fraud just to prevent a merits hearing,
2. fraudulent concealment of fact that no judge can reproduce and defeat any of the over 180 counts of fraud (**test for falsehood of “interests of justice”** which is the only legal ground for an s50 stay)
3. fraudulent concealment of fact that no relief or grounds in any notice of appeal have been reproduced in any order or defeated by applying case law to the facts (**test for falsehood of “little chance of success”** used to wit merit of appeal),
4. collateral attack on October 21 order of Justice Pelletier “notice of constitutional question is a new document ... it should be resubmitted on its own with proof of service on the Attorneys General of the provinces.” **by refusing to hear the s40 Constitutional question**,
5. false statement in writing that “in particular, Mr. Olumide has not suggested that there will be any actual or potential prejudice” **despite 28 documents to court demanding prevention of actual prejudice from hearing s40 application before s40 Federal Courts Act constitutional question** (which Justice Pelletier ruled shall be heard) AND whether the treatment of hearing s40 application before rebuttal evidence to rule 256 admissions to tax fraud, ATIP fraud, perjury, political career destruction causation is an s12 Charter breach,
6. false statement in writing in para 14 “**he has not ever taken the position that Canada cannot bring the motion**”, despite the 28 court records AND collateral attack on Justice Pelletier who on October 21 ruled “...The substance of the request appears to be that “the appellant hereby request direction that the AG is prevented from filing an s40 application to this Court until there has been a Federal Court trial of whether allowing a s40 application is breach of appellant’s s12 Charter rights”.... in essence, he seeks an injunction to prevent the Attorney General for Canada from doing ... substance of the request appears to be that “the AG is prevented from filing a s40 Federal Courts Act application in this Court until there has been a Federal Court judge trial, Federal Court of Appeal, Supreme Court of enclosed notice of an appeal (if August 31 motion before Justice Tabib fails) to determine whether allowing an s40 application to be heard is breach of the appellant’s s12 Charter rights ...”,
7. false statement in writing “**has not indicated in his materials that he will seek leave to continue the proceedings**”, despite prior records stating that s40 order of Justice Martineau will be set aside with on any order hearing s40 constitutional question on the merits,

8. collateral attack on Justice Pelletier who on October 21 ruled that the **Federal Court of Appeal is not bound by the Federal Court**, despite fact s40 application filed in Federal Court / Federal Court of Appeal at the same time, and Federal Court Justice Martineau move to commit fraud quickly on October 4, Justice Pelletier did not commit fraud by staying A164-16, A201-16 (16-A-38), A294-16, A313-16, A367-16, rather he ruled that **letter relief will not be actioned**,
9. collateral attack of Justice Stratas November 17 order granting leave to cross examine respondent affidavit in order to fraudulently conceal the lack of respondent defence to rule 256 admissions to “roughly 1 foot high” affidavit and exhibits
10. removal of equal benefit of rules 81(2), 216(4) on the Notice of cross examination in order to block evidence from the respondents that will incriminate Justice Stratas
11. false statement in writing “the motion to declare Mr Olumide a vexatious litigant remains alive” without stating which court file number contains the alleged motion,
12. false statement in writing in para 22 that “Canada does not know whether it is obligated to take further steps in the appeal or in the vexatious litigant motion” despite Canada knowing it can bring s40 motion in A164-16, 16-A-38 (T892-16), A294-16, A313-16, A367-16 and appellant advised them to do so in 16-A-38 because **T892-16 is same file used for Justice Martineau s40 fraud**,
13. collateral attack on October 21 order of Justice Pelletier “A stay of proceedings can only be obtained by motion, not by letter. **Counsel’s letter shall be given no further effect.**”
14. false statement in writing “letter as motion seeking directions under rule 54” the word s54 does not appear in letter, only recourse in appeal court, is to bring a motion in existing file number,
15. false statement para 23 that “the rule 54 motion is properly before the Court” and in para 40 that “wrong document; this is an irregularity that can be cured” despite s40 constitutional question ground that Court of Appeal s40 power is overbroad, parliament did not give Supreme Court s40, Federal Court of Appeal is not a trial court, it has **no s27 Federal Courts Act jurisdiction to originate applications**,
16. referring to “Federal Government Parties” as beneficiaries of abusing s50 Federal Courts Act, in order to conceal merits hearing of appeal liabilities for **Federal Court / Canadian Judicial Council / Federal Court of Appeal / Supreme Court** parties for which Justice Pelletier refused to issue the Notice of Appeal of Federal Court T1534-16, T1640-16 stay by direction rather than a court order for improper purpose of removing statutory appeal rights,
17. false statement in writing in para 22 “in this rule 54 motion, Canada is not asking the Court to do something **inconsistent with its role as an independent, impartial and neutral arbiter**” despite breaching RWDSU by refusing to hear the 16-A-38 s40 Constitutional Question first and refusing to apply equal treatment of no application without a motion to strike first ,
18. giving **AG legal advice on how to defraud** in A164-16, 16-A-38, A294-16, A313-16, A367-16 with a new s28 Federal Courts Act file without an s28 judicial review application AND false statement in paras 15 and 16 “...free legal advice from the Court. We are not in that line of business. We are independent of the parties, completely impartial and neutral” despite Federal Court or Federal Court of Appeal being parties in T1457-16 / T1534-16 / T1640-16 and **conflict of interest** because any appeal on the merits will **expose falsehoods by a Federal Court of Appeal judge**,
19. false statement in writing “I confirm that **I have approached** and will continue to approach the present matter and any future matters involving Mr. Olumide with an open mind”, despite fact that no court can make a finding that an s50 Federal Courts Act stay is in “**interests of justice**” **without**

reproducing the non-existent respondent defence to over 180 counts of fraud supported by

“roughly 1 foot high” affidavit exhibits OR proof that rule 256 admissions are false,

20. false statement in writing that “The reasonable, fully-informed person, thinking the matter through, would conclude that I am capable of deciding matters involving Mr. Olumide fairly and with an open mind”, despite fact that the **order does not reproduce any of the 180 counts of fraud (interests of justice test on past fraud) or any of the Notice of Appeal relief /grounds (little chance of success test on future appeal)**, therefore “reasonable, fully-informed person” is a falsehood, because no person can think about a matter for which there is no information,

21. declaration of intent to commit fraud in para 33 “It also aims to prevent Mr Olumide from continuing any other existing proceedings”, in order to exceed s12 Interpretations Act, s40, s46(2)

Federal Courts Act power by staying more than one existing proceeding,

22. **abusing s50 Federal Courts Act to exceed s40 Federal Courts Act power** to stay no more than one existing proceeding AND breach property crime self-defence objects of the Federal Courts Act, contravene rule of law and s2(e) Canadian Bill of Rights against criminal’s cruel revictimization of victim acting in self-defence principle of natural justice, remove s12 Charter right to remedy tax fraud, ATIP fraud, perjury, political career destruction, defamation, remove preamble s4 Quebec Charter rights of appellant whose tax office is in Quebec, breach rule of law against arbitrary statutory interpretation which is codified in s12 Interpretations Act, breach rule of law against absurd statutory interpretation of s50 Federal Courts Act, contravene breach of objects; preamble, s10,16 Canadian Victims Bill of Rights, breach s46(2) Federal Courts Act, s24 Charter right to s63(2) Judges Act constitutional question, remove s24 Charter right to s40 Federal Courts Act constitutional question, remove s24 Charter right to s10(2) Access To Information Act / s16(2) Privacy Act constitutional question,

23. collateral attack of Justice Stratas January 3 order granting leave to bring motion to lift the stay and Justice Stratas inability to defeat reasons why an s50 Federal Courts Act stay is illegal

24. false statement in writing that “The motions do not “seek only an order lifting the stay and no other relief” despite fact that the **ONLY** notice of motion relief is “appellant hereby seek declaration that s50 Federal Courts Act stay is lifted because using s50 to... (reasons why abuse of s50 is illegal) ” **in order to fraudulently conceal Justice Stratas inability to defeat the grounds for the ONLY relief,**

25. ordering registry staff to commit fraud by deliberately exceeding s46(2) Federal Courts Act, by in para 45, 47, 48, 49, 51 “notice of motion...will be obtained from the motion record previously filed in the appeal. The registry will file it in the new file... applicants ...shall pay the filing fee... the motion record...will be filed in the new file. This will be deemed to be the application record ... applicants in the new file will file their requisition for hearing”. Then it will advise the parties of the new file number” removal of AG freedom of choice for fraudulent purpose of circumventing AG’s anger with Justice Pelletier for failing to finish the s40 job on October 21,

26. false statement in writing in para 29 “discontinuance ends the proceeding, but what of any pending motions in the proceeding? there are not authorities on point to answer this question. However logic assists us.”, despite authority that shows the only way AG can challenge abandonment is if an appellant brought a motion to resurrect A201-16 (Justice Bell) or motion to strike 16-A-38 (Justice Harrington) because it seeks to reinstate appeal of Justice Bell’s order,

27. fraudulent purpose concealment of motion relief in 16-A-38 (T892-16) by not reopening closed file A201-16 (T892-16) and not refunding \$800 paid for valuable service, but opening a new illegal s28 Federal Courts Act file to conceal T892-16 fraud,

28. false statement in writing in para 14 “this can be done by the Court on its own motion; rule 47” despite s46(2)Federal Courts Act, s12 Interpretations Act, s12 Charter, constitutional rule of law right to property crime self-defence objects limitation on Court created by statute,
29. defraud costs for lack of consent to appeal book for Notice of Appeal of Justice Harrington already issued by registry in accordance to rules that allow amendments of notice of appeal before a reply, by requesting unnecessary supplementary submissions in order to buy time for an s40 order,
30. defraud merit of appeal by fraudulent concealment of 10 Justice Tabib falsehoods in T1049-16, by using s50 Federal Courts Act to defraud property crime self-defence objects of Federal Courts Act / rule of law against criminals’ revictimization of victim acting in self-defence principle of natural justice,
31. giving the Federal Court preferential treatment by not dismissing A201-16 S40 Federal Courts Act motion for failure to file a requisition for oral hearing despite “order of November 17, 2016 shall remain in effect except that the requirement of the filing of a requisition for hearing is eliminated”,
32. referring to “scheduling order of November 17, 2016” as the basis for final disposition, but removing the A201-16 file number for the November 17 order in order to justify refusing to hear the pending reconsideration motion for the “scheduling order of November 17, 2016” that Justice Stratas is relying on to illegally create a new file and hear the discontinued s40 Application,
33. false statement “burden inflicted upon other litigants whose matters are delayed” despite fact that despite Mr Olumide, in 2016 Federal Court of Appeal heard 30 more appeals than in 2015,
34. false statement in writing that there is a “compliant about ... judges ... were alone sufficient basis for recusal, all his proceedings will be in limbo” despite fact that based on these 180 counts of fraud Justices Dawson, Gauthier, Webb, Near, Scott, Woods, Rennie and many other Federal Court judges who can be seconded to hear the appeals are not named in this 180 counts of fraud,
35. false statement “this court has weighed...the resources available to the court”, despite fact that it is trite law that any order made without jurisdiction is void abinitio, therefore resources devoted to s40 application in new file is wasted for lack of s28 Federal Courts Act jurisdiction (it named s28 because as a court of statute, it lacks inherent jurisdiction to create application without source of statutory power),

Judicial review 28 (1) The Federal Court of Appeal has jurisdiction to hear and determine applications for judicial review made in respect of any of the following federal boards, commissions or other tribunals: (a) the Board of Arbitration established by the Canada Agricultural Products Act; (b) the Review Tribunal established by the Canada Agricultural Products Act; (b.1) the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner appointed under section 81 of the Parliament of Canada Act; (c) the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission established by the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission Act; (d) [Repealed, 2012, c. 19, s. 272 (e) the Canadian International Trade Tribunal established by the Canadian International Trade Tribunal Act; (f) the National Energy Board established by the National Energy Board Act; (g) the Governor in Council, when the Governor in Council makes an order under subsection 54(1) of the National Energy Board Act; (g) the Appeal Division of the Social Security Tribunal established under section 44 of the Department of Employment and Social Development Act, unless the decision is made under subsection 57(2) or section 58 of that Act or relates to an appeal brought under subsection 53(3) of that Act or an appeal respecting a decision relating to further time to make a request under subsection 52(2) of that Act, section 81 of the Canada Pension Plan, section 27.1 of the Old Age Security Act or section 112 of the Employment Insurance Act; (h) the Canada Industrial Relations Board established by the Canada Labour Code;

- (i) the Federal Public Sector Labour Relations and Employment Board referred to in subsection 4(1) of the Federal Public Sector Labour Relations and Employment Board Act;
- (i.1) adjudicators as defined in subsection 2(1) of the Federal Public Sector Labour Relations Act;
- (j) the Copyright Board established by the Copyright Act; (k) the Canadian Transportation Agency established by the Canada Transportation Act; (l) [Repealed, 2002, c. 8, s. 35] (m) [Repealed, 2012, c. 19, s. 272] (n) the Competition Tribunal established by the Competition Tribunal Act;
- (o) assessors appointed under the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation Act;
- (p) [Repealed, 2012, c. 19, s. 572] (q) the Public Servants Disclosure Protection Tribunal established by the Public Servants Disclosure Protection Act; and
- (r) the Specific Claims Tribunal established by the Specific Claims Tribunal Act.

- 36. fraudulent concealment of November 17 illegal creation of new s28 application through January 10 theft of Government [Court Admin Services] property (A201-16 Jan 10 suppl. motion record),
- 37. false statement in writing that “the motion brought in file A294-16 for a stay in all proceedings”, despite fact that there is no motion brought in file A294-16 for a stay in all proceedings,
- 38. fraudulent concealment of December 12 illegal stay through January 10 theft of Government [Court Admin Services] property (A294-16 January 10 supplementary motion record),
- 39. false statement in writing that “motion for an order staying all proceedings in this Court until the vexatious litigant application is determined is, in substance, a motion in each of the remaining pending files”, despite fact that there is no motion for an order staying all proceedings, nor can there be, without first bringing a motion for consolidation,
- 40. refusing letter requesting s8(1) Courts Administrations Services Act filing and assignment of A201-16 rule 397 reconsideration motion to Justice Stratas,
- 41. refuse to hear A201-16 reconsideration motion in order to remove Federal Courts Act “relief” “final judgment” “property” rights codified in rule 64, 397, right to without reopening the A201-16 appeal declaration that the Justice Stratas has no jurisdiction to make November 17,2016 A201-16 order creating a new file through s28 Federal Courts Act,
- 42. refuse to hear A201-16 reconsideration motion in order to remove rules 64, 397 right to without reopening the A201-16 appeal declaration that the Justice Stratas has **no jurisdiction to order court staff to falsify court documents by tippexing the file number on them and writing a new file number as if it were written by the AG,**
- 43. false statement in writing that “since the discontinuance and the closure of the file, nothing can be filed in A201-16” despite fact that Justice Stratas filed a November 17 order in file A201-16 despite October 24 Notice of discontinuance,
- 44. defraud rule 397 in order to fraudulently conceal assessment officer rules 409, 400(3) jurisdiction that was affirmed in “Bow Valley Naturalists Society v. Canada (Minister of Canadian Heritage), 2002 FCA 515 (CanLII) [10] Rule 400(3) factors against ... successful litigants ... require carefully considered discretion. Rule 409, being permissive, does not bind an assessment officer to exercise discretion exactly as the Court”, to wit 12, 46(2) Federal Courts Act, Rules 409, 400(3) contrary to s341 of the Criminal Code of Canada.

Ade Olumide