

Attention; Registrar c/o Laura Holder, Case Processing Officer, Human Rights Tribunal of Ontario
Direct Tel: 416-326-1765 or 416-326-1312 | Fax: 416-326-2199 | hrto.registrar@ontario.ca

Alexandra Mingo, Crown Law Office – Civil, Ministry of the Attorney General, McMurtry-Scott Bldg,
720 Bay Street, 8th Floor, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 2S9 Email: Alexandra.Mingo@ontario.ca

Ottawa Police Services Board w/o Wendy Fedec Executive Director 110 Laurier Avenue West Ottawa,
Ontario K1P 1J1 Email: chairottawapsb@ottawa.ca

David Patacairk, City of Ottawa 110 Laurier Avenue West, 3rd Floor - Legal Services, Ottawa, Ontario,
K1P 1J1, Email: David.Patacairk@ottawa.ca

The Honourable George Strathy, Chief Justice Court Of Appeal For Ontario, jacob.bakan@ontario.ca;
Sandra.Theroulde@ontario.ca; Osgoode Hall, 130 Queen Street West, MH5 2N5 Tel: (416) 327-
5020 Fax: (416) 327-5032

The Honourable Heather Forster Smith, Chief Justice of the Superior Court of Justice
Phone: 416-327-5111 Fax: 416-327-6011 Osgoode Hall, 130 Queen St W Toronto ON M5H2N5
c/o Roslyn J. Levine, Q.C. Executive Legal officer, scj-csj.general@ontario.ca

The Honourable Lise Maisonneuve, Chief Justice, Ontario Court of Justice,
60 Queen St. W. Old City Hall, Toronto ON M5H 2M4, c/o Jill Arthur for Ontario Court of Justice
Communications Officer OCJCommunicationsOfficer@ontario.ca; (416) 326-0111

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

April 11, 2018

Open Letter To Ontario Human Rights Tribunal, Vice Chair Jo-Anne Pickel; Refusal to correct your implied racism sympathizer offences are a public power “clear departure” from preamble objects, s29(a,e,i) Human Rights Code which according to the Supreme Court is “as objectionable as fraud”;

1) Despite evidence that former Supreme Court Chief Justice and Chair of Canadian Judicial Council helped Conservative Party brass racists and racism sympathizer judges to destroy Olumide’s political career through no jurisdiction falsehoods motivated by the salient belief that a white career is more important than a black career, you are offended that she is called the Chief Racism Sympathizer but you are not offended by Canadian Judicial Council racism sympathizer crimes, you are blocking filing of exhibits that show that Beverley McLachlin is rightly called the Chief Racism Sympathizer.

2) Despite the lack of a court proceeding in the public foyer beside the entrance, lack of an adjudicative decision, acts motivated by salient belief that a white career is more important than a black career;

- a) you allege that JP Herb Kreling has common law adjudicative immunity for extorting Olumide’s statutory rights to attend a meeting that he was invited to by another JP who had agreed to issue process against Canadian Judicial Council, you are blocking common law racism tests on JP Kreling by lying that common law adjudicative immunity constitutional question cannot succeed.

b) you allege that JP Herb Kreling has common law adjudicative immunity for directing Ottawa Police to arrest and assault Olumide because; his black colour is a security risk, to teach him a lesson for daring to access mandatory criminal code self-defence rights against Canadian Judicial Council racism sympathizer crimes, you are blocking formal requests for production of the video audio recording of the interaction / affidavit evidence from two independent witnesses.

3) Despite their salient belief that a white career is more important than a black career and membership of the Court Justice Act criminal rules committee that includes Ontario AG, Court of Justice, Superior Court, Court of Appeal, you allege that they should not be accountable for refusing s10(a) Charter s2c(i) Canada Bill of rights mandatory constitutional administrative duties to create a rule that will force any court agent that engages police arrest and assault power to file a written justification report with the Court, which per s10(a) Charter s2c(i) Canada Bill of right shall be available on request to victim.

4) Despite their salient belief that a white career is more important than a black career and Ontario AG ownership of s138 Police Services Act that gives court officials power to direct police arrest and assault without filing a written justification report, you allege that they should not be held accountable for refusing s10(a) Charter s2c(i) Canada Bill of right mandatory constitutional administrative duties to change s138 Police Services Act to create a mandatory arrest written justification report as well as a minimum non-compliance penalty for failure to file the report, you are trying to block application by lying that s138 Police Services Act / prosecutorial immunity constitutional question cannot succeed.

5) Despite their salient belief that a white career is more important than a black career and Ottawa Police Chief mandatory Police Services Act policy duties, Ottawa Police Services Board Police Services Act policy duties, Ottawa City Council mandatory Municipal Act, s10(a) Charter & s2c(i) Canada Bill of rights constitutional bylaw duty to ensure that any court official that engages police arrest and assault powers must file a written justification report with the police, which per s10(a) Charter s2c(i) Canada Bill of right shall be available on request to victim, you are lying that application cannot succeed.

Open Letter To Registrar / July 4 Adjudicator

Firstly, please accept this confirmation that I am available to attend the July 4th hearing; however between the October case management direction and today, there has been written submissions between the parties and HRTO; please ensure that the written submissions are made available to the July 4 adjudicator, in the unfortunate event of a criminal prosecution, it is assumed that the adjudicator has read all correspondence between the parties and HRTO.

Secondly, I only agreed to attend the July 4th summary hearing on the condition that I am allowed to start the hearing with a one hour presentation on the following issues. Any order resulting from the July 4 hearing that blocks a merits hearing of the application, without reproducing the pleadings for the 11 issues, in the order and sighting case law to defeat case law sighted by applicant, that would trigger a criminal court prosecution for 11 counts of fraud below.

1) On Merits Adjudication Of October 18 Common law adjudicative immunity Constitutional Question
Judicial Notice Of 3 Legislative Facts

2) On Merits Adjudication Of October 20 Prosecutorial / Tribunal Immunity Constitutional Question
Judicial Notice Of 4 Legislative Facts;

3) On Merits Adjudication Of The Following November 24 Test For Dismissing The Application;

- I. Police Act 138(1)(ii) power to without a court proceeding deny access to a court facility is not an adjudicative decision and is not "integral to the effective exercise of their duties" ^{Jo-Anne Pickel} /
- II. s69 Courts Justice Act Criminal Rules Committee power is subject to s15 s24 Charter of Rights, s1 Human Rights Code, s1(a,b) s2(e) Canadian Bill of Rights, Constitution Acts 1867 to 1982 52(1) "Any law inconsistent with .. Constitution is, to extent of the inconsistency, of no force or effect" /
- III. With about 1 million yearly court cases, it is not in the public interest ^{Jo-Anne Pickel} to have the power to without a court proceeding arrest assault black males because you are afraid of their colour /
- IV. With 1 million yearly court cases, it is not in public interest ^{Jo-Anne Pickel} to encourage arrest assault of blacks by rewarding theft of criminal code statutory right to criminal court mandamus application to prosecute Ontario Court of Justice for criminal code offences that include assault, extortion, fraud / criminal code statutory right to criminal court appeal rights ^{Jo-Anne Pickel} .
- V. Refusing to apply HRTO 3 part test for common law common law adjudicative immunity is defacto bad faith
- VI. Refusing to apply HRTO prima facie racism test for reversing burden of proof is defacto bad faith
- VII. Elevating common law adjudicative immunity above constitutional duties is defacto bad faith
- VIII. Failure to apply Human Rights Commission ultimate and secondary 6 part organization test on Jo-Anne Pickel false statement that she lacks jurisdiction for common law adjudicative immunity constitutional question / criminal rules committee handling of 138(1)(ii) policy matter is.. bad faith

4) On Merits Adjudication Of Formal Orders In Forms 10, 12, 16, 20

THE OTTAWA POLICE ... violated my s1 Human Rights Code right to equal access to 1, 2, 4, 42(1c,d), 81(1)(2) Police Services Act / s6(1)(4), s7(1)(3)(4), 8, Police Services Act Ontario Regulation 58/16 / objects, 2, 6, 7, 10, 16 Canada Victims Bill of Rights / s10(a) Charter s2c(i) Canada Bill of rights to reasons for arrest services .

THE OTTAWA POLICE CHIEF has infringed my s1 Human Rights Code right to equal access to the following s41(1b), 63(1)(2)(3) Police Services Act / 11(2), 13(1)(2) Ontario Regulation 58/16 / objects, 2, 6, 7, 10, 16 Canada Victims Bill of Rights / s10(a) Charter s2c(i) Canada Bill of rights to reasons for arrest services ...

THE OTTAWA POLICE SERVICES BOARD have infringed my s1 Human Rights Code right to equal access to 31(1c), 63(5)(6)(7) Police Services Act / 12 Police Services Act Ontario Regulation

58/16 / objects, 2, 6, 7, 10, 16 Canada Victims Bill of Rights / s10(a) Charter s2c(i) Canada Bill of rights to reasons for arrest services;...

THE OTTAWA CITY COUNCIL have infringed my s1 Human Rights Code right to equal access to the 4(1)(2) Police Services Act / 11(2)(2,6,7,8), 224 (a,b,d.1,f) Municipal Act / objects, 2, 6, 7, 10, 16 Canada Victims Bill of Rights / s10(a) Charter s2c(i) Canada Bill of rights to reasons for arrest services..

THE ONTARIO ATTORNEY GENERAL has infringed my s1 Human Rights Code right to equal access to 5 Attorney General Act services / 5, 14, 36, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 71, 72, 77 Courts Justice Act services and facilities / 3(2), 142 Police Services Act services / Police Services Act 12 Ontario Regulation 58/16 services / s8, s11(a)(b)(d)(f)(h) Crown Attorney Act services / s579 denial of s2 “prosecutor” s482(1) s504 s507.1 s540 s551.2 s551.3(1g Charter) s683(2) s788 s802(1)(2)(3) Criminal Code s24 Charter services prosecution of racism sympathizer Supreme Court of Canada / objects, 2, 6, 7, 10, 16 Canada Victims Bill of Rights / s10(a) Charter s2c(i) Canada Bill of rights to reasons for arrest.

THE CHIEF JUSTICES OF THE ONTARIO COURT OF JUSTICE, SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE, ONTARIO COURT OF APPEAL have infringed my s1 Human Rights Code right to equal access to 5, 14, 36, 65, 66, 67, 69 Courts Justice Act services and facilities / s10 Ontario Interpretation Act s17(3) Justice of Peace Act positive obligation to respond to s138ii policy matter letter which is being used to achieve ongoing denial of the complainant equal access to court “facilities” re prosecution of racism sympathizer Canadian Judicial Council / s2 “prosecutor” s482(1) s504 Criminal Code ministerial services re prosecution of racism sympathizer Canadian Judicial Council / objects, 2, 6, 7, 10, 16 Canada Victims Bill of Rights / s10(a) Charter s2c(i) Canada Bill of rights to reasons for arrest;

All of which respectfully submitted by Ade Olumide