

Open Letter To Canadian Judicial Council Chair Right Honourable Richard Wagner; Request to refer Judges Act “record of investigation” for Supreme Court Chief Justice criminal misconduct complaints to the RCMP, 112 Kent Street, Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0W8, tel. (613) 288-1566; fax (613) 288-1575,

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

April 10, 2018

There exists evidence beyond all reasonable doubt evidence that shows Supreme Court of Canada, Chief Justice, **Right Honourable Richard Wagner C.J.** committed the following crimes which are hereby referred to Canadian Judicial Council, Chair, **Right Honourable Richard Wagner**, they include;

1. Between 2015 to 2018 at the City of Ottawa, Supreme Court Chief Justice Richard Wagner did knowingly breach the public trust by refusing to set oral arguments transcript evidence hearing date for appeal of Supreme Court Registrar refusal to decide constitutionality of Supreme Courts Act Supreme Courts Rules registrar power to refuse to comply with mandatory constitutional and statutory duties to file court documents in **civil proceedings constitutional question**, in order to obtain the personal benefit of fraudulent concealment of Richard Wagner no jurisdiction falsehoods in files 37761, 37763, 37604, 37602, 37605, 37600, 37660, 37603, in contravention of s122 of the Criminal Code of Canada.
2. Between 2015 to 2018 at the City of Ottawa, Supreme Court Chief Justice Richard Wagner did knowingly obstruct justice by refusing to set oral arguments transcript evidence hearing date for appeal of Supreme Court Registrar refusal to decide constitutionality of Supreme Courts Act Supreme Courts Rules registrar power to refuse to comply with mandatory constitutional and statutory duties to file court documents in **criminal proceedings constitutional question**, in order to obtain the personal benefit of enabling Canadian Judicial Council escape files FD-01697, FD-01324, FD-01617, FD-01464, FD-01287, FD-01287, FD 01463, FD-01647, FD-01863 criminal court prosecution for crimes that include refusing to request Judges Act “record of investigation” for criminal misconduct by Richard Wagner, in contravention of 139(1)(2)(3a) of the Criminal Code of Canada.
3. Between 2015 to 2018 at the City of Ottawa, Supreme Court Chief Justice Richard Wagner did make a false statement in writing that file 37884 subject of the leave to appeal application is Quebec Court of Appeal Registrar Bertrand Gervais as opposed to Quebec Court of Appeal Justice Yves-Marie Morissette, with intent that it be relied on to wit s40 Supreme Courts Act jurisdiction, in contravention of s362(1) of the Criminal Code of Canada.
4. Between 2015 to 2018 at the City of Ottawa, Supreme Court Chief Justice Richard Wagner did knowingly make a false statement in writing that the Supreme Court lacks jurisdiction to hear leave to appeal applications of Federal Court of Appeal Justice Stratas “Supreme Courts Act ..final judgements” in files 37761, 37763, 37604, 37602, 37605, 37600, 37660, 37603, with intent that it be relied on to wit s40 Supreme Courts Act jurisdiction, in contravention of s362(1) of the Criminal Code of Canada.
5. Between 2015 to 2018 at the City of Ottawa, Supreme Court Chief Justice Richard Wagner did knowingly by deceit, falsehood and other fraudulent means, defraud \$600 application fee explanation contract with Supreme Court Registrar in files 37761, 37763, 37604, 37602, 37605, 37600, 37660, 37603 by refusing s15 Supreme Courts Act administrative duty to instruct registrar to fulfill the \$600 explanation contract, in contravention of s380(1) of the Criminal Code of Canada.

6. Between 2015 to 2018 at the City of Ottawa, Supreme Court Chief Justice Richard Wagner did refuse to hear civil proceedings constitutional question for a fraudulent purpose of concealment of former Supreme Court Chief Justice Beverley McLachlin refusal of s15 Supreme Courts Act administrative duty in file 36861 to instruct registrar to withdraw Supreme Court service to Conservative Party in order to defraud Supreme Court single judge preliminary motion declaratory relief re Federal Court Federal Court of Appeal Ontario Superior Court Ontario Court of Appeal Conservative Party no jurisdiction falsehoods and party to perjury, in contravention of s341 of the Criminal Code of Canada.

As a result of the Canadian Judicial Council subject of civil and criminal proceedings conflict of interest as well as Canadian Judicial Council Chair Richard Wagner conflict of interest, please ensure that this criminal misconduct complaint is referred to the RCMP who would prepare a Judges Act “record of investigation” for each of the above criminal misconduct offences, that record should be provided to all Canadian Judicial Council members, they will then vote to reprimand or remove of **Right Honourable Richard Wagner**. Naturally Canadian Judicial council members in Ontario, New Brunswick, Alberta, British Columbia, Quebec cannot vote due to their criminal proceedings conflict of interest.

This is consistent with the constitutional rule of law against administrative decisions by persons with a conflict of interest and Canadian Judicial Council; “Impartiality (Chapter 6): Conflicts of Interest 1. Judges **should disqualify themselves** in any case in which they believe they will be **unable to judge impartially**” 2. Judges **should disqualify themselves** in any case in which they believe that a reasonable, fair minded and informed person would have a **reasoned suspicion of conflict between a judge’s personal interest ... and a judge’s duty**”,

Please also be advised that refusing to request a “record of investigation” is a 21b, 23, s22.2, 25.1(9)(11b), 139(1) (2) (3a), 341, 362, s380(1) criminal code indictable offence. Please note, inaction by Canadian Judicial Council is a contravention of the objects of the Judges Act. The ongoing series of **lies to defraud first instance and appellate jurisdiction is an orgy of criminal misconduct by judges** that is being encouraged by the Canadian Judicial Council conflict of interest. There is no justification for the **targeted malice fact** that despite 5 years in court, there has never been a merits hearing of ongoing crimes, the proceeds of crime remains with the criminal.

On April 5, 2018 **Wagner C.J.** and Abella, Moldaver, Karakatsanis, Gascon, Côté, Brown, Rowe and Martin JJ acted in bad faith by violating 21b, 23, s22.2, 25.1(9)(11b), 122, 341, 362, s380(1) Criminal Code by stating that they lacked the jurisdiction to hear leave to appeal of “**Supreme Courts Act final ... decree**” of 3 Quebec Court of Appeal judges as verbally communicated by the Chair of the Panel as communicated in writing by Quebec Court of Appeal Registrar Bertrand Gervais.

They deliberately lied about the order being appealed, because they know that pursuant to s40 Supreme Courts Act, as long as a “substantial right” of the parties are affected, they have jurisdiction to hear an appeal of any interlocutory or final verbal “decree ... decision” of Justice Yves-Marie Morissette”;

- a) Their order states; “The application for leave to appeal from the direction of M. Bertrand Gervais of the Registry of the Court of Appeal of Quebec (Montréal), Number 500-09-026878-173, [2017 QCCA 1343 \(CanLII\)](#), dated October 6, 2017, is dismissed for want of jurisdiction, without costs.”

- b) But the application states; “.. applicant seeks leave to appeal falsely dated October 6, 2017 (shipped by Purolator ground on October 11) judgement of Justice Yves-Marie Morissette “judge who presides the panel” written by Quebec Court of Appeal Clerk Bertrand Gervais ...”

The orders in these 8 files below are written different from 500-09-026878-173, they do not name the written Supreme Courts Act final judgements which were issued by Justice Stratas, it would be too obvious that they were lying, anyone reading the orders might think it was not an order by a judge.

They could have been silent on the reason for dismissal, but all these no s40 jurisdiction s362 criminal offences began because with approval of Chief Justice McLachlin, Roger Bilodeau (government employee) had consistently lied about s40 Supreme Courts Act jurisdiction in order to extort leave to appeal rights in 8 applications, through threats of injury from loss of application fees.

- a) With exception of the file number, all 8 orders had a similar format “The application for leave to appeal from the judgment of the Federal Court of Appeal, Number A-294-16, dated December 12, 2016, is dismissed for want of jurisdiction, without costs.”

Chief Justice Richard Wagner knew he had no jurisdiction to hear the application for leave, because until he has decided the appeal of registrar refusal to hear the pending civil proceedings constitutional question and he directs the registrar to fulfill the \$600 application fees contract, Roger Bilodeau lacked jurisdiction to transmit the application to Richard Wagner, his decision to proceed is mens rae evidence.

Chief Justice Richard Wagner obtained a personal benefit which is an s122 Criminal Code offence, there is pending before Chief Justice Richard Wagner, a civil proceedings motion record appeal of Roger Bilodeau’s constitutional and criminal offences that include defrauding the \$600 explanation contract.

Another motive for their falsehoods is that there are a number of criminal court orders by registrars who were ordered by judges to make final orders, so the criminals in the Supreme Court are desperate to create a two tier court system where judges can use registrars to make orders, in order to obtain personal benefits of covering up their crimes, while, counting on the Canadian Judicial Council Chair who is in a conflict of interest to look the other way. The affected criminal court files are:

- a) Notice of Appeal Ontario Superior Court (Criminal) File 17-30442, 17-30443, 17-30444, 17-30445 (Per Chief Justice Direction, Registrar In “Highest Court Of Final Resort In A Province” Acted Without Jurisdiction In Bad Faith To Remove s784 Criminal Code Appeal Re Prosecution of Office of Auditor General of Canada)
- b) Notice of Appeal New Brunswick Court of Queen’s Bench (Criminal) File (Per Chief Justice Direction, Registrar In “Highest Court Of Final Resort In A Province” Acted Without Jurisdiction In Bad Faith To Remove s784 Criminal Code Appeal Re Prosecution of Canadian Judicial Council Member NBCQB)
- c) Notice of Appeal Ontario Superior Court (Criminal) File 17-MOT-1-93 (Per Chief Justice Direction, Registrar In “Highest Court Of Final Resort In A Province” Acted Without Jurisdiction In Bad Faith To Remove s784 Criminal Code Appeal Re Prosecution of Office of Public Sector Integrity Commissioner)

With exception of Martin JJ who was newly appointed, all 8 justices also lied to obtain a personal benefit, which is an s122 Criminal Code breach of trust. The motive is to cover up previous 8 justices deliberate falsehoods of no s40 Supreme Courts Act jurisdiction to hear leave to appeal in;

In The Supreme Court Of Canada File 37761
(On Appeal From *Federal Court Of Appeal T1640-16*)

Between: *Ade Olumide* (Applicant) And: Supreme Court of Canada, Federal Court, Conservative Party (Respondent)

In The Supreme Court Of Canada File 37763
(On Appeal From *Federal Court Of Appeal T1534-16*)

Between: *Ade Olumide* (Applicant) And: Federal Court of Appeal (Respondent)

In The Supreme Court Of Canada File 37604
(On Appeal From *Federal Court Of Appeal 16-A-38*)

Between: *Ade Olumide* (Applicant) And: Her Majesty The Queen In Right Of Canada (The "Crown") (Respondent)

In The Supreme Court Of Canada File 37602
(On Appeal From *Federal Court Of Appeal A294-16*)

Between: *Ade Olumide* (Applicant) And: Her Majesty The Queen In Right Of Canada (The "Crown") (Respondent)

In The Supreme Court Of Canada File 37605
(On Appeal From *Federal Court Of Appeal A164-16*)

Between: *Ade Olumide* (Applicant) And: Her Majesty The Queen In Right Of Canada (The "Crown") (Respondent)

In The Supreme Court Of Canada File 37600
(On Appeal From *Federal Court Of Appeal A201-16*)

Between: *Ade Olumide* (Applicant) And: Her Majesty The Queen In Right Of Canada (The "Crown") (Respondent)

In The Supreme Court Of Canada File 37660
(On Appeal From *Federal Court Of Appeal A367-16*)

Between: *Ade Olumide* (Applicant) And: Canadian Judicial Council Et Al (Respondent)

In The Supreme Court Of Canada File 37603
(On Appeal From *Federal Court Of Appeal A313-16*)

Between: *Ade Olumide* (Applicant) And: Conservative Party Of Canada (Respondent)

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CANADA

FILE 37884

.... April 3, 2018

Dear Panel, I would like to respectfully advise you that Roger Bilodeau, Supreme Court Registrar entered into a contract with me, upon making the \$600 offer condition for an explanation of Supreme Court Registrar no jurisdiction falsehood, he could have refused to process the applications for leave to appeal, instead he accepted my offer by cashing the cheque, therefore I refused to pay for 37884 application for leave to appeal until he fulfilled the contract, I was therefore shocked to receive a phone call stating that he has asked staff to forward 37884 to a panel. I hereby ask that you not here the purported application, return the file to Roger Bilodeau, and ask him to fulfill the \$600 explanation of no jurisdiction, then I will pay the \$75 and 37884 can be submitted to a panel. **With respect any judge by action or inaction, that allows Roger Bilodeau to evade his contractual obligations, will be responsible for ALL Roger Bilodeau's criminal code and constitutional offences described below;**

Please see enclosed March 22 letter to the Supreme Court.

Please see enclosed United Nations Human Rights Complaint;
<https://adeolumideonline.files.wordpress.com/2018/03/unitednationshumanrightscomplaint.pdf>

Please ask Mr Bilodeau to provide to you the following correspondence (if you decide to commit a crime, it is assumed that you have personally read all enclosed letters to the Supreme Court);

Ade Olumide Ade <ade6035@gmail.com> Thu, Mar 22, 2018 at 2:32 PM
please see attached message from Honourable Jody Wilson-Raybould To Right Honourable Richard Wagner

On Thu, Feb 15, 2018 at 3:11 AM, Ade Olumide Ade <ade6035@gmail.com> wrote:

On Tue, Feb 13, 2018 at 1:29 AM, Ade Olumide Ade <ade6035@gmail.com> wrote:
please see enclosed attachments

On Mon, Feb 5, 2018 at 9:04 AM, Ade Olumide Ade <ade6035@gmail.com> wrote:
please see enclosed attachments

On Mon, Jan 22, 2018 at 10:51 AM, Ade Olumide Ade <ade6035@gmail.com> wrote:
please see enclosed letter to the Supreme Court Chief Justice and a United Nations Complaint

On Sat, Jan 13, 2018 at 11:25 AM, Ade Olumide Ade <ade6035@gmail.com> wrote:
please see enclosed criminal proceedings letter to the Supreme Court Chief Justice and Auditor General of Canada

On Sat, Jan 6, 2018 at 11:43 AM, Ade Olumide Ade <ade6035@gmail.com> wrote:
please see enclosed letter to the Supreme Court Chief Justice and Auditor General of Canada

On Sat, Dec 16, 2017 at 10:22 AM, Ade Olumide Ade <ade6035@gmail.com> wrote:
please see enclosed mandamus motion record constitutional question to chief justice

On Wed, Dec 13, 2017 at 9:12 AM, Ade Olumide Ade <ade6035@gmail.com> wrote:
please see enclosed December 12th letter to the Supreme Court

On Wed, Dec 6, 2017 at 2:57 PM, Ade Olumide Ade <ade6035@gmail.com> wrote:
please see enclosed response to November 29 letter from Office of Auditor General Canada

On Mon, Dec 4, 2017 at 7:24 AM, Ade Olumide Ade <ade6035@gmail.com> wrote:

please see enclosed December 4 letter and Criminal Proceedings Amended Constitutional Question to the Supreme Court Registrar

please see enclosed December 4 letter and Civil Proceedings Amended Constitutional Question to the Supreme Court Registrar

On Wed, Nov 29, 2017 at 5:36 AM, Ade Olumide Ade <ade6035@gmail.com> wrote:
please see enclosed November 29 letter and Criminal Proceedings Constitutional Question to the Supreme Court Registrar

On Mon, Nov 13, 2017 at 11:04 AM, Ade Olumide Ade <ade6035@gmail.com> wrote:
please see enclosed November 13 letter and Constitutional Question to the Supreme Court

On Fri, Nov 10, 2017 at 10:14 PM, Ade Olumide Ade <ade6035@gmail.com> wrote:
please see enclosed November 10 letter and Constitutional Question to the Supreme Court

On Sun, Nov 5, 2017 at 3:49 PM, Ade Olumide Ade <ade6035@gmail.com> wrote:
please see enclosed November 4 letter and Constitutional Question to the Supreme Court

On Mon, Oct 30, 2017 at 12:08 AM, Ade Olumide Ade <ade6035@gmail.com> wrote:

please see enclosed October 30th letter to the Supreme Court

On Fri, Oct 20, 2017 at 8:58 PM, Ade Olumide Ade <ade6035@gmail.com> wrote:
please see enclosed October 20th letter to the Supreme Court

On Wed, Oct 4, 2017 at 8:31 AM, Ade Olumide Ade <ade6035@gmail.com> wrote:
please see enclosed October 4th letter to the Supreme Court

On Mon, Aug 28, 2017 at 10:26 AM, Ade Olumide Ade <ade6035@gmail.com> wrote:
please see enclosed August 28th letter to the Supreme Court

On Mon, Aug 21, 2017 at 4:44 PM, Ade Olumide Ade <ade6035@gmail.com> wrote:
please see enclosed 8th letter to the Supreme Court

On Tue, Aug 8, 2017 at 12:25 PM, Ade Olumide Ade <ade6035@gmail.com> wrote:
please see enclosed 7th letter to the Supreme Court

On Thu, Aug 3, 2017 at 1:06 PM, Ade Olumide Ade <ade6035@gmail.com> wrote:
please see enclosed 6th letter to the Supreme Court

On Wed, Jul 26, 2017 at 10:39 AM, Ade Olumide Ade <ade6035@gmail.com> wrote:
please see enclosed 5th letter to the Supreme Court

On Wed, Jul 5, 2017 at 12:18 PM, Ade Olumide Ade <ade6035@gmail.com> wrote:
please see enclosed 4th letter to the Supreme Court

On Thu, Jun 22, 2017 at 1:02 PM, Ade Olumide Ade <ade6035@gmail.com> wrote:
please see enclosed 3rd letter to the Supreme Court

On Sat, May 20, 2017 at 5:26 PM, Ade Olumide Ade <ade6035@gmail.com> wrote:
please see enclosed 2nd letter

On Wed, May 17, 2017 at 6:15 PM, Ade Olumide Ade <ade6035@gmail.com> wrote:
please see enclosed letter

From: Ade Olumide Ade ade6035@gmail.com Date: Tue, Apr 18, 2017 at 10:39 AM
Subject: Letter From Ade Olumide To Supreme Court Chief Justice CC Respondents By Email

Message from: The Honourable Jody Wilson-Raybould, P.C., Q.C., M.P. Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada

To: Supreme Court of Canada, Chief Justice of Canada, Right Honourable Richard Wagner, P.C.,
Tel 613-995-4330 Fax 613-996-9138, 301 Wellington Street, Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0J1,

To: Canadian Judicial Council, Chair, Right Honourable Richard Wagner, P.C., Tel (613) 288-1566 Fax (613) 288-1575,
112 Kent Street, Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0W8,

CC: Michael Ferguson, Auditor General of Canada, Telephone 1-888-761-5953 Fax 613-957-0474, Office of the Auditor General of Canada, 240 Sparks Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0G6 Canada c/o Legal Counsel, Office of the Auditor General of Canada erin.kelly@oag-bvg.gc.ca Tel: 613-952-0213 (6421)

CC: Joe Friday, Public Sector Integrity Commissioner of Canada, 60 Queen Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1P 5Y7, Telephone: 1-866-941-6400, Fax: 613-946-2151

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CANADA (ON APPEAL FROM)
Federal Court Of Appeal File A53-15

Federal Court Of Appeal File 16-A-20
 Federal Court Of Appeal File 16-A-38,
 Federal Court Of Appeal File A294-16,
 Federal Court Of Appeal File A367-16,
 Federal Court Of Appeal File A164-16,
 Federal Court Of Appeal File A201-16,
 Federal Court Of Appeal File A313-16,
 Federal Court Of Appeal File T1534-16,
 Federal Court Of Appeal File T1640-16,
 Ontario Court of Appeal File C61130,
 Ontario Court of Appeal File C61636,
 Ontario Court of Appeal M47086, M47151,
 Quebec Court Of Appeal 500-09-026878-173
 Criminal Ontario Superior Court Files 16-30442, 16-30443, 16-30444, 16-30445
 Criminal Ontario Superior Court File 16-30604,
 Criminal Ontario Superior Court File CR-17-00000001-00M0,
 Criminal Ontario Superior Court File 17-MOT-1-93,
 Criminal Ontario Superior Court File 17-MOT-1-93,
 Criminal New Brunswick Court of Queens Bench
 Criminal BC Supreme Court File 27229-1
 Criminal Quebec Superior Court 550-36-000021-178
 Criminal Alberta Court Of Queen’s Bench File 170510184X1
ADE OLUMIDE **APPLICANT**

**BETWEEN:
 RESPONDENTS;**

CANADIAN JUDICIAL COUNCIL and
 SUPREME COURT OF CANADA and
 FEDERAL COURT OF APPEAL and
 FEDERAL COURT OF CANADA, and
 ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA and
 CONSERVATIVE FUND OF CANADA and
 CONSERVATIVE PARTY OF CANADA and
 HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN IN RIGHT OF ONTARIO and
 ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NEW BRUNSWICK and
 DIRECTOR OF THE PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS OF CANADA and
 ATTORNEY GENERAL OF BRITISH COLUMBIA and
 HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN (ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA) and
 ATTORNEY GENERAL OF QUEBEC and
 CONSEIL DE LA MAGISTRATURE and
 ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ALBERTA

..... March 22, 2018

In a March 21, 2018 email, Hon Jody Wilson-Raybould, Attorney General of Canada wrote *“In the event that a judge .. committed a criminal offence, the CJC (Canadian Judicial Council) can investigate ... whether the judge should be removed from office ... the Criminal Code applies to all Canadians, including judges, law enforcement officials may investigate a judge for breach of the Criminal Code and lay charges ...”*. This confirms Olumide’s assertion that; the Chair of CJC is in a conflict of interest to decide whether to request an RCMP “record of investigation” of himself, this also confirms that written false statements by judges, police, crown prosecutors that courts and CJC have immunity from charges, are beyond all reasonable doubt evidence of ongoing s139 obstruction of justice criminal offences.

I sent your Honour a **civil proceedings constitutional question motion record** on December 18 AND letters dated January 8, 15, 22, February 13, 15, 2018. The registrar is not a judge, if there is no civil proceedings constitutional question oral hearing date, no fulfillment of s40 Supreme Courts Act

jurisdiction \$600 explanation contract with mens rae to also defraud Conseil / Conservative Party civil applications, I have no choice but to prosecute the Supreme Court of Canada for party to tax fraud AND per 2018 BCSC 324 sue the Supreme Court for defrauding;

- a) inalienable natural constitutional rule of law right to self-defence against revictimize the victim of ongoing tax fraud crimes through s22 Criminal Code incitement of new crimes of arrest, assault, extortion, through defamatory online stories that perpetually attack the dignity, honour and reputation of plaintiff, family and descendants, as codified in the UN International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) Article 17; Universal Declaration of Human Rights Article 12.; "No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his .. family, .. nor to attacks upon his honour and reputation. Everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks." s4 Quebec Charter "Every person has a right to the safeguard of his dignity, honour and reputation".

Samaroo v. Canada Revenue Agency, 2018 BCSC 324 [398] ... the courts are not hesitant to make significant awards when someone's **professional reputation is damaged by reprehensible conduct**, as in *Hill v. Church of Scientology of Toronto*, [1995] 2 S.C.R. 1130 [*Hill*]. In *Hill*, the prosecutor who was maliciously defamed by the defendants was awarded \$300,000 general damages; \$500,000 aggravated damages; and \$800,000 punitive damages. [399] Enormous harm can be done by **falsely accusing a person of dishonesty, as it strikes at the very heart and dignity of a person**. Mrs. Arsenovski expressed it well: it hurt her in her heart and soul. [400] In *Hill*, the Court provided a **historical review of the significance of false accusations of dishonesty**, including the following: [107]..Yet, to most people, their **good reputation is to be cherished above all**. A good reputation is closely related to the innate worthiness and dignity of the individual. It is an attribute that must, just as much as freedom of expression, be protected by society's laws. In order to undertake the balancing required by this case, something must be said about the value of reputation. 108] Democracy has always recognized and cherished the fundamental importance of an individual. That importance must, in turn, be based upon the good repute of a person. It is that good repute which enhances an individual's sense of worth and value. False allegations can so very quickly and completely destroy a good reputation. **A reputation tarnished by libel can seldom regain its former lustre**. A democratic society, therefore, has an interest in ensuring that its members can enjoy and protect their good reputation so long as it is merited. See also paras. 109-117. [401] The fact that Mrs. Arsenovski was not a **public figure** or a professional does not mean that her reputation was deserving of less respect or protection. In many ways, she was all the more susceptible to harm than an established professional person, given that she was a **recent migrant** to the country, on social assistance, likely unaware of her rights or how to access justice. [402] Community standards can be gauged in part by the jury award of \$1 million for punitive damages against an insurance company which had **wrongly accused the insured homeowners of burning down their own house**, an award upheld by the Supreme Court of Canada in *Whiten*.

Excerpts of Letter Sent On February 15 To Chief Justice Richard Wagner

On February 14, 2018 I received a letter from Registrar Roger Bilodeau, the letter is dated February 5, 2018, it purports a reply to the December 18 civil proceedings constitutional question motion record appealing his refusal to hear the civil proceedings constitutional question to Your Honour, he cites civil files 36859, 37105, 37246, 37600, 37602, 37603, 37604, 37605, 37660, 37672, 37763, 37761. He relies on Supreme Court Rules 73(4) as described in May 15, 2014, *Vlasta Stubicar v Deputy Prime Minister of Public Safety 35368* but he provides no case law proving that Rules 73(4) is constitutional.

As you must know the Supreme Court has ruled in SCR 504, 2003 SCC that Roger Bilodeau has the power and jurisdiction to hear the constitutional question, therefore; ALL refusal to file civil proceedings reconsiderations motion records AND refusal to file motion to appeal his oral hearing refusal to hear the civil proceedings constitutional question, ALL refusals to file s784 Criminal Code Notices of Appeal AND refusal to file motion to appeal his oral hearing refusal to hear the criminal proceedings constitutional question, are void abinitio for lack of jurisdiction.

Consequently I await the inevitable oral hearing date for the appeal of the registrar's refusal to hear the civil proceedings constitutional question AND criminal proceedings constitutional question. With respect failure to comply would trigger another criminal misconduct complaint to the Canadian Judicial Council and a s122 Criminal Code breach of trust criminal prosecution.

Nova Scotia (Workers' Compensation Board) v. Martin; [2003] 2 SCR 504, 2003 SCC 54 (CanLII) The Constitution is the supreme law of Canada and, by virtue of s. 52(1) of the Constitution Act, 1982, the question of constitutional validity inheres in every legislative enactment. From this principle of constitutional supremacy flows, as a practical corollary, the idea that Canadians should be entitled to assert the rights and freedoms that the Constitution guarantees them in the most accessible forum available, without the need for parallel proceedings before the courts. ..

In light of the following excerpts from prior correspondence it is impossible for Roger Bilodeau to conclude that he has jurisdiction to issue another Rule 73(4) February 5 letter, without hearing the initial civil proceedings Rule 73(4) constitutional question. If Registrar Roger Bilodeau is a black african immigrant with english language deficiencies, can you please authorize an interpreter to explain the content of the December 18, January 8, 15, 22, February 13, 2018 correspondence, for example;

Excerpts of Letter Sent On February 13 To Chief Justice Richard Wagner

Your letter dated January 24, 2018 re Ade Olumide v Attorney General of Ontario File FD-01697 is void abinitio because until the February 13 motion to appeal the registrar's ongoing refusal to hear the criminal proceedings constitutional question is heard, the letter is void abinitio.

Your letter dated January 22, 2018 re Ade Olumide v Supreme Court of Canada et al File 37761 is void abinitio because until the December 18 motion to appeal the registrar's ongoing refusal to hear the civil proceedings constitutional question is heard, the letter is void abinitio.

I await my \$600 contract right to receive explanation for no s40 Supreme Courts Act jurisdiction to hear appeal of 6 orders by a Federal Court of Appeal single judge, 2 decisions by a Federal Court of Appeal single judge, as a prerequisite to \$75 application fee for Conseil Quebec Court of Appeal 500-09-026878-173 registrar order, the same no s40 Supreme Courts Act jurisdiction explanation issue will affect t the \$75 application fee for Conservative Party Ontario Court of Appeal C61636 registrar order.

Excerpts of Letter Sent On January 15 To Chief Justice Richard Wagner

The Chief Justice is encouraging discrimination against black politicians, by acting without jurisdiction in proceedings where the Canadian Judicial Council / Supreme Court of Canada is a party and in violation of the rule of law against using public power in bad faith by refusing to hear appeal of the registrar's decision to act without jurisdiction and in bad faith by refusing to hear a constitutional

question in order to cover up a falsehood by all 9 Supreme Court justices (The Right Honourable McLachlin, Beverley; Abella, Rosalie Silberman; Moldaver, Michael J.; Karakatsanis, Andromache; Wagner, Richard; Gascon, Clément; Côté, Suzanne; Brown, Russell; Rowe, Malcolm) who issued a no s40 Supreme Courts Act jurisdiction to hear leave appeal motion of 6 final orders, 2 final directions by a single Federal Court of Appeal judge.

There is a pending complaint about this crime before Canadian Judicial Council Chair Richard Wagner, therefore the inaction refusal of Chief Justice Richard Wagner to direct the Registrar to comply with the rule of law by hearing the civil proceedings constitutional question and hearing the criminal proceedings constitutional question, creates a personal benefit of avoidance of CJC reprimand or removal to Chief Justice Richard Wagner. The Supreme Court test for s122 Criminal Code breach of trust is engaged;

R. v. Boulanger, [2006] 2 S.C.R. 49, 2006 SCC The offence of breach of trust by a public officer is established where the Crown proves beyond a reasonable doubt that: (1) the accused is an official; (2) the accused was acting in connection with the duties of his or her office; (3) the accused breached the standard of responsibility and conduct demanded of him or her by the nature of the office; (4) the accused's conduct represented a serious and marked departure from the standards expected of an individual in the accused's position of public trust; and (5) the accused acted with the intention to use his or her public office for a purpose other than the public good, for example, a dishonest, partial, corrupt, or oppressive purpose.

Johnston et al. v. Prince Edward Island, 1995 10509 (NL SCTD).... *City of Kamloops v. Nielsen*, [1984 CanLII 21 \(SCC\)](#), ...: '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....

Supreme Court Registrar

The registrar is acting without jurisdiction in proceedings where the Supreme Court is a party and in violation of the rule of law against using public power in bad faith by refusing to hear a motion on the constitutionality of the rules that he claims gives him public power to refuse constitutional mandatory duty to file civil proceedings new evidence reconsideration motion records in civil files in order to cover up crimes that include a falsehood by the Supreme Court Registrar who wrote no s40 Supreme Courts Act jurisdiction to hear leave appeal application for 6 final orders, 2 final directions by a single Federal Court of Appeal judge against parties that include Canada, Conservative Party, Canadian Judicial Council, Federal Court, Federal Court of Appeal, Supreme Court of Canada.

“On April 6, the registrar wrote; “Section 40 of the Supreme Court Act provides that the Court can hear appeals from “any final or other judgment of the Federal Court of Appeal or of the highest court of final resort in a province, or a judge thereof.” That means that the decision you are appealing from must be a final judgement that cannot be appealed anywhere but in this Court. ... your application may be premature ... If you decide to apply to this Court ...your application will be dismissed because the Court does not have jurisdiction”. He cashed a \$600 cheque based on a contract that he will provide a **written explanation** re s362(1) Criminal Code false statements that s40 Supreme Court is not jurisdiction to hear civil appeals of final decisions by any court of appeal single judge or clerk refusing to schedule an appeal before a panel of judges.

Canada legislated meaning of “40(1)” “appeal” “final judgement” “judgment” “judicial proceeding”, the following irrefutable legal conclusion are based on government legislation that the Registrar and all Supreme Court Justices are familiar with, they chose to make false statements about jurisdiction in order to extort appeal rights with threats of injury from loss of application fees.

- a) Any interlocutory or final judgement by a single judge can be appealed
- b) Any interlocutory or final judgement by a panel of judges can be appealed
- c) All registrar are under a mandatory statutory duty to comply with any Chief Justice verbal or written direction, therefore inaction by any Chief Justice to a request to change the final decision of a registrar to refuse to open a file number, is Chief Justice final judgment that can be appealed
- d) “judgment” that can be appealed is defined in the Supreme Court Act as including other verbal or written decisions which are not orders.
- e) There is nothing in the Supreme Court Act that a decision has to be in writing.
- f) There is nothing in the Supreme Court Act that a decision has to have a file number.
- g) The word “decree” includes implied oral decisions by Chief Justice to a registry officer.
- h) The lack of decision to issue a file number is an implied decision that can be appealed.
- i) The word includes means that as long as it affects “substantive right of any of the parties in controversy”, any verbal or written or implied decision can be appealed”

Supreme Court Act (R.S.C., 1985, C. S-26) Definitions 2 (1) In this Act, appeal includes **any proceeding** to set aside or vary any judgment of the **court appealed from**; (appel) final judgment means any judgment, rule, order **or decision** that determines in whole or in part any **substantive right** of any of the parties in controversy in any judicial proceeding;

judgment, when used with reference to the court appealed from, includes any judgment, rule, order, **decision**, decree, decretal order or sentence thereof, and when used with reference to the Supreme Court, includes any judgment or order of that Court; (jugement)

judicial proceeding includes any action, suit, **cause, matter or other proceeding** in disposing of which the court appealed from has not exercised merely a regulative, administrative or executive jurisdiction;

“Appeals with leave of Supreme Court 40 (1) Subject to subsection (3), an appeal lies to the Supreme Court from any final **or other judgment** of the Federal Court of Appeal or of the highest court of final resort in a province, or a judge thereof, in which judgment can be had in the particular case sought to be appealed to the Supreme Court, whether or not leave to appeal to the Supreme Court has been refused by any other court, where, with respect to the particular case sought to be appealed, the Supreme Court is of the opinion that any question involved therein is, **by reason of its public importance or the importance of any issue of law** or any issue of mixed law and fact involved in that question, one that ought to be decided by the Supreme Court or is, for any other reason, **of such a nature or significance** as to warrant decision by it, and leave to appeal from that judgment is accordingly granted by the Supreme Court.

... **Excerpts Of Letter Sent On January 8 To Chief Justice Richard Wagner**

...S15, 97(1C) SUPREME COURT ACT 8(2), 19(2), 73(4), 78(3) SUPREME COURT RULES
CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION (CIVIL) CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION HEARING DATE

Mr. Bilodeau, Mr. Ferguson, you know the “emperor has no clothes”. I previously advised you, that you are in a hole, so stop digging, you refused to heed good advice, and hatched what you thought was a simple plan to defraud the black african immigrant with alleged “english language deficiencies”, in the end, there will be legislative Judges Act changes that will create a separate path for criminal misconduct.

<https://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=The%20emperor%20wears%20no%20clothes>

"The Emperor Wears No Clothes" or "The Emperor Has No Clothes" is often used in political and social contexts for any obvious truth denied by the majority despite the evidence of their eyes, especially when proclaimed by the government. When people say "The emperor wears no clothes", they mean that other people need to stop being .. to a political leader and see things for what they truly are instead of denying the truth of the situation. It takes a person with guts to speak the truth and blast through the .. lies.

The former White House Communications Director Anthony Scaramucci stated that when a fish stinks, it stinks from the head down. The Supreme Court Registrar Roger Bilodeau has breached s22 Criminal Code by counselling Supreme Court registrar Jill Hache to assist him to commit an s341 criminal code offence of requesting money under the false pretence that he would provide an explanation for lying about s40 Supreme Courts Act civil appeals jurisdiction.

Auditor General Michael Ferguson is lying because the “emperor has no clothes”. Prime Minister Justin Trudeau’s father gave a black immigrant like me Charter rights, why is the son defrauding me of the rights given by his father? Racism sympathizer public servant Supreme Court Registrar Roger Bilodeau is violating s380(1) Criminal Code by refusing to hear enclosed civil proceedings constitutional question in order to defraud transcript evidence that he deliberately lied about s40 Supreme Courts Act jurisdiction in order to cuddle and encourage racists within Conservative “Party Brass”.

https://adeolumideonline.files.wordpress.com/2017/12/openletter_officeauditorgeneralcanada.pdf

Further to enclosed excerpts from December 18 letter, Olumide is **still waiting for the constitutional question oral hearing date** triggered by the registrar’s power to refuse filing of a motion record;

S362(1) Criminal Offence By Supreme Court Registrar Roger Bilodeau

Roger Bilodeau cashed a \$600 cheque based on a contract that he will provide a written explanation re s362(1) Criminal Code false statements that s40 Supreme Court is not evidence of jurisdiction to hear civil appeals of final decisions by a any court of appeal single judge or clerk refusing to schedule an appeal before a panel of judges. While I wait for his explanation on the 8 files involved in the \$600 contract, he asked Jill Hache to send a letter dated December 18, 2017 asking for another \$75. I cannot send the requested \$75 until Roger Bilodeau has fulfilled the \$600 written explanations contract.

I am just a black african immigrant, who according to racism sympathizer Superior Court Justice Charles Hackland is deficient in english, so he must fulfill the \$600 contract, I need help to understand s40 Supreme Courts Act english. Racism sympathizer public sector employee Canadian Judicial Council Executive Director Norman Sabourin refused to request creation of the record of investigation by sighting Justice Hackland deficiencies in english quote.

If Roger Bilodeau processes the leave to appeal without the \$75 or refuses to explain Supreme Court lack of jurisdiction to hear application for leave to appeal final judgement of Quebec Court of Appeal Clerk Mr Bertrand Gervais refusing to comply with a statutory duty to schedule before a panel of judges,

the appeal correctly opened by Assistant Clerk Mtre Julie Devroede, that would be a new trigger for an s362(1) criminal code prosecution.

<https://adeolumideonline.files.wordpress.com/2017/06/canadian-judicial-council-chair-supreme-court-chief-justice-beverley-maclachlin-retires-amid-police-investigation-part-1.pdf>

There is an idiom that says “fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me”, there is no idiom for full me 9 times, no one is that stupid. Even if I just fell of a banana tree and landed in court, I was able to without being elected convince 37 city elected councils to pass a motion that hydro should be affordable, therefore I cannot be as stupid as you think. In the end, there will be a Canadian Judicial Council Judges Act “record of investigation” for all judicial criminal misconduct complaints.

Excerpts of December 12 Motion To Chief Justice Richard Wagner ...DECLARATION THAT;

1) Whereas rule 78(3) is unconstitutionally overbroad because it allows the Registrar to act in bad faith abuse of process to do indirectly [use s15, 97(1c) Supreme Court Act 8(2), 19(2), 73(4) Rules] what cannot be done directly [defraud 52(1) Constitution Acts, 1867 to 1982, s24 Charter of Rights].

2) Whereas the Chief Justice Richard Wagner has no immunity if he permits Registrar Roger Bilodeau to act without jurisdiction by using s15, 97(1c) Supreme Court Act 8(2), 19(2), 73(4) Rules before deciding the constitutionality of s15, 97(1c) Supreme Court Act 8(2), 19(2), 73(4) Rules, any letter refusing to file reconsideration motion records in files 36859, 37105, 37246, 37600, 37602, 37603, 37604, 37605, 37660, 37672, 37763, 37761, are void abinitio due to lack of jurisdiction.

3) Whereas Roger Bilodeau Supreme Court Registrar is a Government Of Canada employee with an s12 Charter duty of care to the applicant made several false statements about s40 Supreme Courts Act jurisdiction in order to extort Supreme Courts Act leave to appeal statutory rights AND breached his \$600 contract duty to respond to s40 Supreme Courts Act jurisdiction rebuttals AND consequently defrauded applicant right to reply before submission to the court, any submission of \$600 extortion issue court documents to a judge is void abinitio for lack of jurisdiction to breach s12 Charter rights.

S15 Supreme Court Act is unconstitutionally overbroad it shall read in as follows; “15 Subject to the Constitution of Canada and direction of the Chief Justice the Registrar shall superintend ...”, in the alternative s15 is read down and the AG shall have 6 months to remedy s15.

S97(1c) Supreme Court Act is unconstitutionally overbroad it shall read in as follows; “97(1)(c) for empowering the Registrar to subject to the Constitution of Canada do any such thing and transact any such business as is specified in the rules or orders, and to exercise any authority and jurisdiction in respect of the rules or orders as may be done,” in the alternative s97(1c) is read down and the AG shall have 6 months to remedy s97(1c).

S78(3) Supreme Court Rules is unconstitutionally overbroad it shall read in as follows; “78 (3) subject to s97(1c)(2)(3) Supreme Court Act ..Registrar’s decision to refuse to accept a document under .. 8(2) or 73(4) is not an order” in the alternative S78(3) is read down, SC shall have 6 months to remedy S78(4).

S73(4) Supreme Court Rules is unconstitutionally overbroad it shall read in as follows; “73 (4) The Registrar may subject to s97(1c)(2)(3) Supreme Court Act ~~shall~~ refuse to accept a motion for reconsideration ..” in the alternative S73(4) is read down, SC shall have 6 months to remedy S73(4).

S8(2) Supreme Court Rules is unconstitutionally overbroad it shall read in as follows; “8(2) The Court, a judge or the Registrar may subject to s97(1c)(2)(3) Supreme Court Act refuse a document that does not comply with these Rules ...” in the alternative 8(2) is read down, SC has 6 months to remedy s8(2).

S19(2) Supreme Court Rules is unconstitutionally overbroad it shall read in as follows; “19(2) On receipt of a document, the Registrar may subject to s97(1c)(2)(3) Supreme Court Act (a) accept or reject the document for filing;” in the alternative 19(2) is read down, SC shall has 6 months to remedy s19(2).

Outstanding Matters From October 30 Letter

I received your October 23 response to my October 4, 20 letters, while the reply only addresses T-1534-16 and T-1640-16 AKA \$150 explanation contract fraud, you repeat the lie that “the Court does not have jurisdiction”, this is the same 16-A-38, A294-16, A367-16, A164-16, A201-16, A313-16, \$450 explanation contract fraud issue,

Supreme Court Lawyer Is Calling Supreme Court Registrar A Liar

1) .. The Supreme Court lawyer Anna Turinov writes “Further to the response of the respondent, Federal Court of Canada, please be advised that **we are taking no position**”. That is a mea culpa, so if your own lawyer does not believe you, why is that not enough to convict you? Perjury is a criminal offence, if you really want to prove that you have honest belief in no jurisdiction, **put your answer in an affidavit**.

Submitting The \$600 Explanation Contract Fraud Files Is A Crime

2) I warn you and your staff not to file this as a response to the respondents, that would be fraud. There are false allegations in the respondents \$600 explanation contract fraud replies, I am entitled to respond after Roger Bilodeau has fulfilling the \$600 contract. He was warned that if he cannot explain his “no jurisdiction” statement, he cannot cash the cheque, he cashed the cheque therefore he must explain before we can all move on. If you of your staff submit \$600 explanation contract fraud files to the judges without my response to the respondents, that would be a fraudulent purpose breach of contract.

Quebec Court Of Appeal Is Calling Roger Bilodeau A Liar

3) A Clerk in the Quebec Court of Appeal acted without jurisdiction to strike a civil appeal, he argue that I should appeal to the Supreme Court jurisdiction, I provided him a copy of your letter “premature ... dismissed because the Court does not have jurisdiction” in order to convince him to comply with the statutory requirement that only 3 judges can strike an appeal. Despite several letters to the Chief Justices, Montreal Police Director, other judges, the Clerk and the judges he works for, were so afraid of the content of the appeal, that he acted without jurisdiction to strike the appeal without an order signed by 3 judges. Therefore the Quebec Court of Appeal does not believe your s40 letter.

In Alternative, Admit To Extortion

4) You as a government employee chose to threaten me with injury of loss of \$600 application fees by lying no jurisdiction before the fees were paid with mens rae to save the government and the Supreme Court. That gave me the right to ask you for an explanation to the following questions, if you cannot provide an explanation, you have to admit that you lied to extort me of my s40 rights.

Factual Test For Fulfilling \$600 Explanation Contract

5) The test for fulfilling the \$600 explanation contract has been provided to you many times. I advised you to stop lying because you have to lie to cover up another lie, but you refused to take my advice. In order to fulfill the \$600 contract, you must provide an alternative interpretation of each of the following paragraphs Excerpts From October 4 Letter;

Federal Court Of Appeal File T1640-16 [Rule Of Law And S12 S21 Canada Interpretation Right To Remedy For Supreme Court Conservative Party Fraud],

Please explain April 6 text; “The Federal Court of Appeal decision dated January 23, 2017 does not fall within the meaning of s40 as explained above. ... no judgement was issued in File number T-1640-16 If you decide to apply ... for leave to appeal.. Your application will be dismissed because the Court does not have jurisdiction.”

16 Criminal Code Offences By Supreme Court Registrar

6) Contract Fraud; “You did not take my advice, now you have now stolen \$450, you know the laws of contract, I offered \$450 for a service (explanation of the meaning of “premature...no jurisdiction”), I just received a receipt from you dated August 22, I was very clear that without the explanation, cashing the cheque is theft, you proceeded to cash the cheque which is fraud because you have not delivered the service I paid for.

7) Defrauding A367-17 Right To Reply; “As you know I am precluded from responding in A367-16 until I receive a letter “**explaining the meaning** of “premature ... dismissed because the Court does not have jurisdiction”, if you do not fulfill your end of the contract, you are a thief and I will charge you for this theft and other crimes.”

8) Conspiracy With The Crown; “Since you knew you were lying, you initially made the tactical fraudulent decision to proceed on A367-16, without cashing the cheque, but chose to cash the cheque because the Crown overruled by decision b replying other files without an authorization to reply. You sent a receipt without “explanation of the meaning of “premature ... dismissed because the Court does not have jurisdiction”. You cannot have it both ways, now that you have issue a receipt to help the Crown, you must explain “premature ... dismissed because the Court does not have jurisdiction” or face prosecution for theft of \$450.”

9) “Premature ... Dismissed Because The Court Does Not Have Jurisdiction” Is Deliberately False With Mens Rae To Extort Statutory Appeal Rights;

“On April 6, you wrote; “Section 40 of the Supreme Court Act provides that the Court can hear appeals from “any final or other judgment of the Federal Court of Appeal or of the highest court of final resort in a province, or a judge thereof.” That means that the decision you are appealing from must be a final judgement that cannot be appealed anywhere but in this Court. ... your application may be premature ... If you decide to apply to this Court ...your application will be dismissed because the Court does not have jurisdiction”

It is clear that this falsehood and threat of injury is intended to defraud “If you decide to apply to this Court for leave”, further the use of words like “may” “could have” “strong possibility” is evidence that you knew that you were lying about the meaning of s40, this goes to motive, for seeking to exploit my “English language deficiencies” fraudulently identified by Justice Hackland and Norman Sabourin.

Despite repeated evidence of this falsehood, this threat of injury was repeated in the following letters (12 counts of a s362 criminal code offence);

8 Letters dated April 6, Letter dated April 13, Letter dated June 7, Letter dated May 16, Letter dated August 11

On May 20 I wrote ..., so you cannot lie that you do not know that you are committing fraud; “Appeals with leave of Supreme Court 40 (1) Subject to subsection (3), an appeal lies to the Supreme Court from any final **or other judgment** of the Federal Court of Appeal or of the highest court of final resort in a province, or a judge thereof, in which judgment can be had in the particular case sought to be appealed to the Supreme Court, whether or not leave to appeal to the Supreme Court has been refused by any other court, where, with respect to the particular case sought to be appealed, the Supreme Court is of the opinion that any question involved therein is, **by reason of its public importance or the importance of any issue of law** or any issue of mixed law and fact involved in that question, one that ought to be decided by the Supreme Court or is, for any other reason, **of such a nature or significance** as to warrant decision by it, and leave to appeal from that judgment is accordingly granted by the Supreme Court.

Firstly “or” means in the alternative, s40 provides 4 types of order that can be appealed; any final ...

or other judgment of the Federal Court of Appeal ...

or of the highest court of final resort in a province ...

or a judge thereof.”

Secondly, “judgment” is defined in the Supreme Court Act to include other verbal or written decisions.

<http://legal-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/decision>

Decision; A conclusion reached after an evaluation of facts and law. As a **generic term**, decision refers to both administrative and **judicial** determinations. It includes final judgments, **rulings, and interlocutory or provisional** orders made by the court pending the outcome of the case. Frequently, a decision is considered the **initial step** in a rendition by a court of a judgment in an action. When referring to judicial matters, a decision is not the same as an opinion, although the terms are sometimes used interchangeably. A decision is the **pronouncement of the solution of the court** or judgment in a case, while an opinion is a statement of the reasons for its determination made by the court.

- There is nothing in the Supreme Court Act that a decision has to be in writing.
- There is nothing in the Supreme Court Act that a decision has to have a file number. ...
- The lack of decision to issue a file number is a decision that can be appealed.
- The word includes means that as long as it affects any of the “substantive right of any of the parties in controversy”, any verbal or written or implied decision can be appealed”

Please explain why the Court has jurisdiction over fraud by Justice Gleason in 37105 but no jurisdiction in these 8 files? These counts and the orders in question were before you, please explain how the Supreme Court jurisdiction over 162 counts of fraud is premature? How many counts of fraud will it take for the Supreme Court to have jurisdiction? ...”

10) Mr Bilodeau lied that s40 leave to appeal in 6 Federal Court of Appeal files are “premature”.

11) Mr Bilodeau lied that there is no s40 leave to appeal “jurisdiction” in 8 Federal Court of Appeal files, because the “decision you are appealing must be a final judgement”.

12) Mr Bilodeau lied that “Supreme Court Act ... an appeal to the Supreme Court lies on a question of law alone with leave of that Court, from a final judgment of the Federal Court or of a court of a province other than the highest court of final resort therein” “court appealed from means the court from which the appeal is brought directly to the Supreme Court, whether that court is one of original jurisdiction or a court of appeal” does not include Ontario Superior Court, Federal Court, New Brunswick Court of Queens Bench.

Please also be advised that the Parliament of Canada has exclusive Constitution Acts 1867 to 1982 Legislative Authority of Parliament of Canada 91 ‘Criminal Law ‘ constitutional jurisdiction to write the Criminal Code. The following show that the Supreme Court does not have immunity from criminal prosecution for deliberately making false statements with mens rae to defraud property and service;

S504 “ ...the justice shall receive the information, where it is allegedthat **the person** has committed, anywhere, an indictable offence”

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

“**justice system participant** means...(b) a **person** who plays a role in the administration of criminal justice, including...(iii) a judge and a justice, ...(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) a **public body**, body corporate, society, company, firm, partnership, trade union or municipality, or (b) **an association of persons that (i) is created for a common purpose, (ii) has an operational structure, and (iii) holds itself out to the public as an association of persons;**”

22.2 ... 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 .. 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 ... (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;**

...

All of which respectfully submitted by Ade Olumide