

Subject: FW: Constituent
Attachments: 20140305141802.pdf

s.22

From: Southwick, Celine A [<mailto:Celine.Southwick@leg.bc.ca>]
Sent: March-05-14 2:30 PM
To: Ives, Andrew JAG:EX
Subject: FW: Constituent

s.22

Hello Andrew,

MLA Pimm asked that forward these letters from

s.22

Please cc me any responses to the constituent.

Thank you,

Celine Southwick

Constituency Assistant
Pat Pimm, M.L.A.
(Peace River North)
Fort St. John BC
(250) 263-0101

From: ricohmfd@leg.bc.ca [<mailto:ricohmfd@leg.bc.ca>]
Sent: March 5, 2014 3:18 PM
To: Southwick, Celine A
Subject: RicohScan

Feb 23/2014

All the best Lemm.

Dear Sir,

- 1) Could you please, provide me with a answer before the end of March 2014 as to why Mr Morpe, QC. who is a lawyer stated in his letter to you dated January 6/2014 (THAT THE LAW SOCIETY OF B.C. OPERATES INDEPENDENTLY OF GOVERNMENT)
- 2) And whether the Attorney General of B.C. who is also a lawyer, and a Benchers, agrees that a lawyer that lies to the Law Society B.C. during a investigation, is not a issue.
- 3) I believe Mr Lemm, that as a cabinet minister of B.C. you should be given correct and proper information from the Attorney General's Office

Sincerely

Subject: FW: Complaint against BC Human Rights Tribunal
Attachments: s.22 pdf

From: Lee, Chantal <Chantal.Lee@leg.bc.ca>
Sent: Friday, March 7, 2014 1:13 PM
To: Ives, Andrew JAG:EX
Subject: RE: Complaint against BC Human Rights Tribunal

Hi Andrew,

Thanks for all the information on the liquor announcement and your help to keep us on top of the issue! Much appreciated.

I am now following up with you on an old case initiated back in August 2013. Please refer to our emails below. At that time, we encouraged them to contact the Ombudsperson's office based on your advice. However, in early January 2014, they delivered 3 sets of form letters, signed by s.22 As per their request, we mailed one of the three sets to your ministry, another set to the Premier's office and the other for our office to keep. I am attaching a scanned copy of our set for your reference.

Yesterday, we received an email from s.22 requesting a response to their letters:

From: s.22
Sent: March 6, 2014 12:26 PM
To: Virk.MLA, Amrik
Subject: HRT Debacle

Hello Mr. Virk.

As you may recall sometime back I hand delivered to your assistant Jared a number of signed letters to be sent to the Premier and Susan Anton and of course Mr. Virk. Is there any reason that none of the letter writers including myself have not had the courtesy of a reply from any of the parties those letters were addressed to? This issue is serious and needs to be addressed not only for ourselves s.22 but for other innocent parties being abused by this poorly thought out legislation. The lack of any communication is disappointing.

We await a reply.

Thank you,

s.22

We are wondering if your ministry is going to respond to them and cc our office or you have any advice on this.

Thank you again for your help,

Chantal

..

Chantal Lee
Constituency Assistant to
Hon. Amrik Virk, MLA
Surrey-Tynehead
201-15135 101 Ave., Surrey, BC V3R 7Z1
Tel: 604.586.3747 | Fax: 604.584.4741
www.amrikvirkmla.ca

This e-mail is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential information. Any review, distribution, copying, printing or other use of this e-mail by anyone other than the named recipient is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error or are not the named recipient, please notify the sender immediately and permanently delete this e-mail and all copies of it. Thank you.

Not Responsive

From: Lee, Chantal [<mailto:Chantal.Lee@leg.bc.ca>]
Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2013 3:23 PM
To: Ives, Andrew JAG:EX
Subject: Complaint against BC Human Rights Tribunal

Hi Andrew

Thanks for taking my call.

It's about a group of constituents, s.22 being brought to the BC Human Rights Tribunal by s.22
s.22 According to them, s.22 When s.22 filed their
complaint with the BC Human Rights Tribunal, the Tribunal accepted it. Now it's up to s.22 to prove that they didn't
do what were accused of. They are very upset that they have to put in hundreds of hours and thousands of money to defend
themselves for the wrongful accusation.

They would like to file a complaint against the BC Human Rights Tribunal.

Looking forward to your advice.

Thank you,

Chantal

Chantal Lee
Constituency Assistant to
Hon. Amrik Virk
Surrey-Tynehead
Ph: 604.586.3747 | Fax: 604.584.4741
www.amrikvirkmla.ca

This e-mail is intended only for the person (s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential information. Any review, distribution, copying, printing or other use of this e-mail by anyone other than the name recipient is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error or are not the named recipient, please notify the sender immediately and permanently delete this e-mail and all copies of it. Thank you.

West Vancouver-Capilano
409 - 545 Clyde Avenue
West Vancouver, B.C.
V7T 1C5



East Annex
Parliament Buildings
Victoria, B.C.
V8V 1X4

RALPH SULTAN, M.L.A.

March 21 / 2014

Hon. Suzanne Anton

Re: Holes in the Law

Is there any comfort
you could present I
offer my constituent?

Sounds good.

Ralph

RECEIVED	
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL	
MAR 27 2014 407622	
REFER TO MAIL REGISTRY <input type="checkbox"/>	
OTHER	
<input type="checkbox"/> DRAFT REPLY	REPLY DIRECT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> ATTN: FILE	FILE <input type="checkbox"/> INFORMATION <input type="checkbox"/>

Telephone: 604-981-0050 Fax: 604-981-0055
e-mail: ralph.sultan.mla@leg.bc.ca
website: www.ralphsultanmla.ca

Anton

Oaken, Terry

From: s.22
Sent: March 10, 2014 4:08 PM
To: Sultan.MLA, Ralph
Subject: A HUGE HOLE IN CIVIL LAW
Attachments: Letter to Deputy Solicitor General.pdf; Arrest Order.pdf
Importance: High

Mr. Ralph Sultan:

Dear Sir:

Please find attached a copy of a letter written to:

Chief Operating Officer Justice Reform and Deputy Solicitor General
Lori Wanamaker
PO Box 9290 Stn Prov Govt
Victoria BC
V8W 9J7

s.22

Why or how? Because civil law has a huge hole in it. The defendant in this case knows that and is exploiting it. It appears the law is more on the side of the defendant than the Plaintiff in civil matters. When a defendant s.22 understands all the nuances of the law and works with lawyers who choose to protect their client rather than see justice done, plaintiffs s.22 are left out in the cold.

The small claims court is a good system. It works very well in cases where there is dispute over billings or debts between people with some integrity. But when it comes down to the crooks who set out to fleece people, it breaks down.

How?

Because arrest orders from a provincial court cannot be placed into the CPIC system, therefore the defendant will never be caught unless by pure happenstance. If the law was amended to allow cases s.22 (where it is proven beyond doubt the defendant is in fully able to pay the judgment and is deliberately choosing not to and s.22) to be put into the CPIC system, the defendant would be apprehended at a border crossing or if pulled over for a traffic violation. As it stands right now, the defendant is bullet proof.

This is a serious matter. It is a matter of contempt of the law and the courts. Something has to be done. An amendment to the law? A judge setting precedent? As it stands, the law and the courts are totally useless in cases such as mine.

Yours truly

s.22

Subject: FW: Bill 17 Will Encourage Corrupt Practice by Developers

From: Virk.MLA, Amrik [<mailto:Amrik.Virk.MLA@leg.bc.ca>]
Sent: March-24-14 9:45 AM
To: Minister, JAG JAG:EX
Subject: FW: Bill 17 Will Encourage Corrupt Practice by Developers
Importance: High

FYI

Chantal Lee
Constituency Assistant to
Hon. Amrik Virk, MLA
Surrey-Tynehead
201-15135 101 Ave., Surrey, BC V3R 7Z1
Tel: 604.586.3747 | Fax: 604.584.4741
www.amrikvirkmla.ca

This e-mail is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential information. Any review, distribution, copying, printing or other use of this e-mail by anyone other than the named recipient is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error or are not the named recipient, please notify the sender immediately and permanently delete this e-mail and all copies of it. Thank you.

From: Strata Advocate [<mailto:strataadvocate@telus.net>]
Sent: March 24, 2014 9:34 AM
To: Strata Advocate
Subject: Bill 17 Will Encourage Corrupt Practice by Developers
Importance: High

Dear MLA,

Minister of Justice, Suzanne Anton recently introduced Bill 17 (Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 2014) that includes a proposal to add a new section 23(2) to the Real Estate Development Marketing Act:

This proposal would prevent a purchaser from terminating a purchase agreement when there has been a material misrepresentation by the developer and the developer claims to have been unaware of the misrepresentation. This leaves it open to a developer to recklessly include unsubstantiated information in a purchase agreement in order to induce sales. This would mean "open season" on purchasers by irresponsible developers who could later claim ignorance as an excuse for misrepresentation. The developer's actions would be excused by the proposed section 23(2).

The proposal is of great concern to condo buyers and many others who are buying real estate from a developer. Many of them have written to me and expressed why they believe this legislation must be stopped: Here are just a few of their comments:

"Because it is not fair"

"It is so difficult to get a full and accurate understanding when entering into real estate transactions without having it made more so."

"The onus should be on the developer to get their facts right."

"Stop Bill 17"

"Real Estate developers cannot be relied on to do the right thing without proper legislation"

"This is unacceptable"

"The proposed addition enforces a real estate sale based on false information while putting owners at risk of great financial loss."

"There are already too many loopholes for unscrupulous developers to hoodwink unsuspecting buyers (as well as real estate sales persons and perhaps even some lawyers). The attitude, in this case, of "buyer beware" is unacceptable."

"I will one day set foot into this part of my life and I would like to know the Government that I elected is there to protect me and my generation from fraudulent acts"

" I believe in honest and open transactions"

"Purchasers of real estate in BC, and in particular purchasers of strata property already have the deck stacked against them because of the government's failure to develop strict enforcement of the Strata Property Act."

"Developers already bypass the deposit rules for sale of real estate by having it payable directly to the developer instead of being held in trust by a third party. deposits are now non refundable! "

"A purchaser needs to be protected from sloppy or unscrupulous sellers/developers. As in any contract, all is considered true; otherwise, it is NOT a contract, legally or morally."

"CONSUMER PROTECTION"

"It is an unfair practice on vulnerable people by big business."

The proposed section 23(2) should be withdrawn. The right of a purchaser to back out of a purchase agreement when a developer's misrepresentation is discovered should be decided by a trial judge and not barred by a statute written to serve the interests of developers at the expense of consumers.

Sincerely,
Deryk Norton
Editor
Strata Advocate
wwwDOTstrataadvocateDOTca

This email is free from viruses and malware because avast! Antivirus protection is active.

Subject: FW: RicohScan
Attachments: 20140324101027.pdf

From: Begin, Robert Gary [<mailto:RobertGary.Begin@leg.bc.ca>]
Sent: March-24-14 10:14 AM
To: Ives, Andrew JAG:EX
Subject: FW: RicohScan

Morning Andrew: I understand that you folk are responsible for Provincial Electoral Boundaries. Please find a copy of a letter sent to Richard T. Lee MLA BURNABY NORTH. Thanks. Gary Begin

From: ricohmfd@leg.bc.ca [<mailto:ricohmfd@leg.bc.ca>]
Sent: March 24, 2014 10:11 AM
To: Begin, Robert Gary
Subject: RicohScan

March 10, 2014

Richard T. Lee, MLA for Burnaby North,
1833 Willingdon Avenue,
Burnaby, BC., V5C 5R3
Phone: 250 356-3052, 604 775-0778

re: Provincial Electoral Boundaries
ie BILL 2 — 2014, The Electoral Boundaries Commission Amendment Act

Dear Richard:

Real democracy means that each person has equal legislative power; this means each person has an equal opportunity to affect legislation. No vote should have more or less impact than another.

With the 2008 redrawing of the BC electoral boundaries the population of the riding of Comox Valley was 59,482 and that of Stikine was 20,622. The result of this was that a vote in the Stikine was worth almost three votes in Comox Valley. The BC Electoral Boundaries Commission recommended against this; it was a decision of the legislature.

Now the Liberal government has introduced a bill to make this disparity the law, and with population growth the disparity is getting worse with time. Using the latest census figures one finds the largest disparity in 2011 was a factor of 3.6. The argument for such a disparity in populations in the past was that it was needed to obtain effective representation in areas where communication was difficult. With modern communications this argument is no longer valid. Bill Bennett's argument is that "I have become concerned that those people that live in small towns in rural areas of the province are losing their political power". What does this mean? One could make a better argument that inner city residents need more representation than average in order to help raise their standard of living, and that it is more difficult to serve them because of poverty and language problems.

This bill is a step backwards. This legislation is surely unconstitutional; the government should withdraw it. That would be better than having to go to court.

It is interesting to note that for the Provincial electoral districts the BC legislature makes the final decision, whereas for the Federal electoral districts it is the Federal Boundaries Commission that has the final say.

During the 2012 B.C. Federal Boundaries Commission hearings I neither read nor heard any arguments like Bill Bennett's and if there were any the Commission did not bow to them; all but one of the riding populations are within 10% of the average; the one exception had a population 14 % below the average.

It would evidently be better to have the BC Boundaries Commission, not the legislature, be in charge of the decision on the BC boundaries.

I am therefore requesting that you persuade the government

- (1) To withdraw Bill 2
- (2) To introduce legislation that removes the final decision from the legislature and puts it into the hands of the Electoral Boundaries Commission.

Subject:

FW:

From: Anton.MLA, Suzanne [mailto:Suzanne.Anton.MLA@leg.bc.ca]
Sent: March-26-14 11:20 AM
To: Minister, JAG JAG:EX
Subject: FW:

--

Yulin Shih

Constituency Assistant to
Suzanne Anton Q.C.
MLA Vancouver-Fraserview
Office: (604) 660-2035 | Direct: (604) 660-2228
Fax: (604) 660-2368 | Mobile: (778) 873-9785

From: s.22
Date: Wed, 26 Mar 2014 06:08:14 -0700
To: Y Shih <suzanne.anton.mla@leg.bc.ca>

Dear Ms Anton,

I this morning's CBC online | read about a man released just six hours after a vicious assault. Please see:

"A man charged in a vicious assault on the owner of a Vancouver tattoo parlour is back on the streets, despite being wanted in connection with a series of other recent crimes in the downtown core.

Byron Thomas Hobbs, 32, was released Monday night — just six hours after surveillance cameras caught a violent attack on tape"

The rest of the article:.. <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/vancouver-tattoo-parlour-attack-video-suspect-back-on-streets-1.2586599>

Why does this happen that attackers such as this are released so quickly. I would appreciate a reply.

s.22

Subject: FW: New submission from Contact Your Constituency

From: Anton.MLA, Suzanne [mailto:Suzanne.Anton.MLA@leg.bc.ca]
Sent: March-26-14 2:27 PM
To: Minister, JAG JAG:EX
Subject: FW: New submission from Contact Your Constituency

--

Yulin Shih

Constituency Assistant to
Suzanne Anton Q.C.
MLA Vancouver-Fraserview
Office: (604) 660-2035 | Direct: (604) 660-2228
Fax: (604) 660-2368 | Mobile: (778) 873-9785

From: Y Shih <suzanne.anton.mla@leg.bc.ca>
Date: Fri, 21 Mar 2014 16:38:31 +0000
To: Y Shih <suzanne.anton.mla@leg.bc.ca>
Subject: New submission from Contact Your Constituency

Name

s.22

Email

s.22

Riding

s.22

Comments & Feedback

A Langley, B.C. female school teacher has just received two years house arrest for sexually touching and giving oral sex to an 11 year old boy. The judge said the teacher had an

unfulfilled marriage - and so this punishment fits the crime of destroying the life of an 11 year old innocent boy.

In February 2014, a Toronto anesthesiologist received 10 years for sexual misconduct to 21 adult woman (sexual touching and oral sex). Ten years in prison vs 2 years house arrest.

Is two years house arrest justice? The Toronto situation included 21 woman but the Langley situation is about an 11 year old innocent child.

Once again, our justice system uses kid gloves when convicting woman. What other criminal activity is accepted when we have unfulfilled marriages???

When will our justice system do its job of holding criminals accountable for their crimes, particularly crimes against children? And when will our justice system stop using kid gloves when sentencing female criminals.

I look forward to your response.

Subject: FW: Your letters and email of November 18 and 19, 2013

From: Watson, Emily PREM:EX
Sent: April-02-14 1:26 PM
To: Minister, JAG JAG:EX
Subject: FW: Your letters and email of November 18 and 19, 2013

Hi Candice,

Sending over to you as FYI.

Thanks!
Emily

From: s.22
Sent: March-31-14 7:23 PM
To: OfficeofthePremier, Office PREM:EX; Clark.MLA, Christy LASS:EX
Subject: Fw: Your letters and email of November 18 and 19, 2013

Hi Christy,

You are getting bad legal advice again ! I never received this reply. It came through

s.22

Love 'n Light.

s.22

"Honesty has a beautiful and refreshing simplicity about it. No ulterior motives. No hidden meanings. An absence of hypocrisy, duplicity, political games, and verbal superficiality. As honesty and real integrity characterize our lives, there will be no need to manipulate others."--Chuck Swindoll

On Monday, March 31, 2014 5:02:49 PM,

s.22

wrote:

FYI

On Monday, March 31, 2014 3:43:33 PM, AG LSB CSD Mail AG:EX <AGLSBCSDMail@gov.bc.ca> wrote:

s.22

Email:

s.22

Dear

s.22

Your letter dated November 18, 2013, addressed to Christy Clark, MLA for Westside-Kelowna, has been forwarded to this ministry for response. I have also received a copy of your letter of November 19, 2013, addressed to Premier Clark, and your email of November 19, 2013, addressed to Richard J. M. Fyfe, Q.C., Deputy Attorney General, and Peter Ameerali, Barrister and Solicitor, Legal Services Branch. I

am responding on behalf of the Attorney General and Minister of Justice. Please accept my apology for the delay in responding.

In your November 18, 2013 letter, you allege that Mr. Ameerali has a conflict of interest "in getting involved in s.22 concerns to her MLA, Christy Clark, as he was s.22" In particular, you raise concerns that he responded, on behalf of this ministry, to s.22 October 3, 2013 letter addressed to Christy Clark, MLA for Westside-Kelowna. In this instance, the MLA's office forwarded s.22 letter to the ministry that was in the best position to address the issues raised in the incoming correspondence, namely the Ministry of Justice. I find no conflict of interest in Mr. Ameerali responding to s.22 letter. He had some familiarity with her issues and was an appropriate person to respond to her. It is also appropriate that any of your or s.22 future correspondence to the provincial government involving s.22 will continue to be referred to this ministry.

In your November 19, 2013 letter, you state that the Deputy Attorney General has assigned Mr. Ameerali to investigate your complaint about s.22. You further allege that Mr. Ameerali has a conflict of interest "due to his having acted as legal counsel in the case filed by s.22." Your assumption that Mr. Ameerali has been assigned to s.22 investigate your complaint about s.22 is not correct, and there is no conflict of interest.

I hope that this information will be helpful.

Sincerely,

Kurt J. W. Sandstrom, Q.C.
Assistant Deputy Attorney General

pc: The Honourable Christy Clark

Subject:

Attachments:

s.22

From: Watson, Emily PREM:EX

Sent: April-04-14 9:31 AM

To: Minister, JAG JAG:EX

Subject: s.22

Hi Candice,

Staff have not scanned the rest of the document, as it's quite large, but the cover letter should give an idea of whether or not JAG can advise on action?

If it's something you can take – we can sent over the original.

Thanks,

Emily

Emily Watson

Correspondence Officer

Premier's Correspondence Branch

(250) 387-3939

West Kelowna, March 27, 2014

Delivered by Hand

To The Premier of British Columbia,

The Honourable Christy Clark, MLA

Dear Madam Premier,

The accompanying documents inform your government of a situation that can best be described as a persistent attempt by a United States authority to extort money from a British Columbia senior citizen. It is because of our belief in your firm commitment to improve and safeguard the future of our province and her citizens that we have decided to bring this matter to your personal attention, both as Premier of our Province and as our MLA.

s.22

The wholly undeserved aggravation s.22 has been experiencing with a court-appointed public trustee in the State of Washington who appears to be trawling for money across the border, is clearly spelled out in s.22 covering letter and the attached court documents.

We have every good reason to believe that you would wish to be alerted to such underhanded manoeuvrings in your Province that fly in the face of Canada's sovereignty and the protection of the rights of her citizens. It is in this spirit that we ask you to bring your influence to bear to put a stop to this affront.

Most sincerely and with our respect,

s.22

s.22

s.22

Not Responsive

From: Krenzler, Katrina C [mailto:Katrina.Krenzler@leg.bc.ca]

Sent: April-09-14 12:54 PM

To: Ives, Andrew JAG:EX

Subject: Re: s.22

Hi Andrew

s.22 has come into the office with complaints that the Family Maintenance do not seem to be helping her. Her ex is s.22 It is a court order that s.22 She has asked for another case manager and has been told that she cannot have on. I have given s.22 information on Mediate BC and have explained that if it court order that she may have to take it back to court s.22 Her ex is currently s.22

Let me know if I should have given her another direction or if there is something else we can do. Thanks

Sincerely,

Katrina Krenzler

Constituency Assistant to the Honourable Shirley Bond

MLA for Prince George - Valemount www.shirleybondmla.bc.ca

☎ Phone: (250) 612-4181 Toll free 1-866-612-7333

☎ Fax: (250) 612-4188

Subject: FW: Changes in Statutes of Limitations

Original Message

From: Ames, Lisa <Lisa.Ames@leg.bc.ca>
Sent: Friday, April 11, 2014 4:16 PM
To: Ives, Andrew JAG:EX
Subject: FW: Changes in Statutes of Limitations

Hi Andrew-

Please see below - is this true?

Thx,
Lisa

-----Original Message-----

From: s.22
Sent: January 27, 2014 6:20 AM
To: Sturdy.MLA, Jordan
Subject: Changes in Statutes of Limitations

I have recently learned through a lawyer that in order to reduce the number of law suits against local governments the Liberal government introduced legislation that reduced the statutes of limitations (the time frame in which to file a law suit) from the normal 2 or 7 years to 2 months thereby making it virtually impossible for anyone to file a law suit against a local government no matter how legitimate or strong their case. Does this legislation may also apply to the provincial government. If this information is correct, how did this happen with no medial coverage?

Subject: FW: s.22 - MLA Clark
Attachments: 20140411103719.pdf; 20140411104003.pdf
Importance: High

From: Macnab, Erica L [<mailto:Erica.Macnab@leg.bc.ca>]
Sent: April-11-14 11:10 AM
To: Ives, Andrew JAG:EX
Subject: FW: s.22 - MLA Clark
Importance: High

Hi Andrew,

Please review the attachments, and give me a call..

Thanks,

Erica Macnab,
Constituency Asst. to the **Honourable Christy Clark, MLA**
Westside-Kelowna
(T) 250.768.8426
(F) 250.768.8436
(W) www.christyclarkmlabc.ca

Erica

From: ricohmfd@leg.bc.ca [<mailto:ricohmfd@leg.bc.ca>]
Sent: April 11, 2014 10:37 AM
To: Macnab, Erica L
Subject: s.22 - MLA Clark

April 10, 2014

Premier Christy Clark:

I have tried repeatedly to get my withheld for no legitimate reason CHARTER Remedy distributed to me from the Ministry of Justice of British Columbia.

There is no reason for a "parallel proceeding" through the law courts, who have no jurisdiction over Charter Remedy, to have my acceded to by *the court of competent jurisdiction* for CHARTER Remedy distributed: this statement complies fully with the exact words of s. 24(1) of *The Charter of Rights and Freedoms*.

Page 16 of the neutral citation 2003 SCC 54 - the words of The Ministry of Justice of Canada - stipulate the following (Exhibit AA in my documents):

The Charter of Rights and Freedoms belongs to the people. All law and LAWMAKERS that touch the people MUST CONFORM TO IT.

As my CHARTER Remedy was granted and made real on February 26, 2014 by *the court of competent jurisdiction* to do so and my matters cannot be addressed by the supreme court of British Columbia, I expect that you, *the lawmaker* in this instance, must bring me my real CHARTER Remedy - deliver it to me out of the hands of the Ministry of Justice because *all lawmakers*, when informed of the real existence of a granted CHARTER Remedy - *Enforcement of The Charter of Rights and Freedoms* (s. 24(1)), must comply with this standard especially since The Province of British Columbia is no longer part of my CHARTER Remedy other than distributing it to me: it has already been granted and fulfilled and just needs to be delivered which the Ministry of Justice of British Columbia cannot do as they are your servants and NOT *lawmakers*.

I expect a call early next week, please, pursuant to The Charter Dictates!

Page 1 of 2

I discovered the hidden CHARTER Remedy due process and I would greatly appreciate receiving the reward for having done so and wholly privately, please!

Praise be unto God Almighty in the name of Jesus Christ, Amen.

s.22

s.22

April 10, 2014

Premier Christy Clark:

I have a CHARTER Remedy **pending distribution** from The Ministry of Justice and Attorney General of British Columbia that should not be withheld **nor** require a “parallel proceeding” before your court of law system.

In April 2012, a CHARTER Remedy in my matters from January - March 2012 was granted *by the court of competent jurisdiction*.

s.22

s.22 I corrected my Charter Remedy and *the court of competent jurisdiction*, for acceding to the final amended alternative CHARTER Remedy *IN MY CASE*, did just that and notified me through our established and PRIVATE lines of communication of this fact.

On April 3, 2014, I was asked by email to contact The Ministry of Justice of British Columbia concerning my final amended alternative Charter Remedy. I did this on Friday of last week and on Sunday and again Wednesday of this week.

I have had absolutely no response from The Ministry of Justice of British Columbia concerning my legitimate demand that my CHARTER Remedy, which went before *the court of competent jurisdiction* in February 2014 and it was acceded to by February 26, 2014 according to the records that I have provided to the Ministry of Justice of British Columbia, be distributed to me.

I have tried repeatedly to get my withheld for no legitimate reason CHARTER Remedy distributed to me from the Ministry of Justice of British Columbia.

There is no reason for a “parallel proceeding” through the law courts, who have no jurisdiction over Charter Remedy, to have my acceded to by *the court of competent jurisdiction* for CHARTER Remedy distributed: this statement complies fully with the exact words of s. 24(1) of *The Charter of Rights and Freedoms*.

Page 1 of 2

Please, insure that the Ministry of Justice of British Columbia complies with the reality that it is in violation of *The Charter of Rights and Freedoms* for NOT distributing the already granted CHARTER Remedy *IN MY CASE* and forthwith distributes my Charter Remedy to me especially since they have no jurisdiction to do as they are doing.

I discovered the hidden CHARTER Remedy due process and I would greatly appreciate receiving the reward for having done so and wholly private, please!

Praise be unto God Almighty in the name of Jesus Christ, Amen.

s.22

Attached: copy of the April 16, 2013 email from the ADAG;
copy of the April 2, 2012 email from the ADAG;
copy of the email sent to the Ministry of Justice on Wednesday, April 9, 2014;
censored copy of the Charter Remedy and its standards put forth to *the court of competent jurisdiction* having *exclusive jurisdiction* for the acceding to Charter Remedy where it is strictly financial as my final amended alternative CHARTER Remedy IS and Charter Remedy does NOT come out of the provincial budget! ;
Exhibit AA with s. 9(1) of the supreme court act of BC, R.S.B.C. 1996, c. 443

Subject: FW: New Wills Regulations.....

-----Original Message-----

From: Anton.MLA, Suzanne [mailto:Suzanne.Anton.MLA@leg.bc.ca]

Sent: April-11-14 9:45 AM

To: Minister, JAG JAG:EX

Subject: FW: New Wills Regulations.....

--
Yulin Shih

Constituency Assistant to

Suzanne Anton Q.C.

MLA Vancouver-Fraserview

Office: (604) 660-2035 | Direct: (604) 660-2228

Fax: (604) 660-2368 | Mobile: (778) 873-9785

On 2014-04-09, 10:48 PM,

s.22

wrote:

>Hi Suzanne,

>

>I wrote April 2, but haven't received a reply.

>Im sure you're busy.

>

>I wrote a will about 15 years ago.

>I got married for the first time, 3 years ago.

>

>Does the will from 15 years ago, remain revoked, because it and my

>marriage both occurred prior to March 31, 2014?

>

>The reporter from the Vancouver Sun, R. Shaw, isn't sure. No one else I

>know is, as well.

>

>Thank-you for your assistance in clarifying your new regulations.

>

s.22

>----- Forwarded message from

s.22

>

> Date: Wed, 02 Apr 2014 23:32:07 -0700

> From: s.22

> Reply-To: s.22

> Subject: New Wills Regulations.....

> To: Suzanne.anton.mla@leg.bc.ca

>

>Hi Suzanne,

>

>I have question/concern.

>

>Section 15 has not been carried forward, meaning the will is not

>revoked upon marrying someone.

>

>Is this for all marriages March 31, 2014 and forward, or all marriages

>prior to March 31, 2014 as well?

>

s.22

>Is this correct?

>Thank-you for your assistance in clarifying this.

s.22

>----- End forwarded message -----

Subject: FW: From MLA Michelle Stilwell

From: Cummins, Shari [mailto:Shari.Cummins@leg.bc.ca]

Sent: April-22-14 12:30 PM

To: Ives, Andrew JAG:EX

Subject: From MLA Michelle Stilwell

Hi Andrew,

MLA Michelle Stilwell has been contacted by a young constituent who is struggling with an estate dispute. He has some opinions and questions about government involvement in/supervision of estate executors.

MLA Stilwell has asked me to share his letter (below) with the Minister's office. If appropriate, please copy MLA Stilwell on correspondence with s.22

Regards,

Shari Cummins
Constituency Assistant for
Michelle Stilwell, MLA
Parksville-Qualicum
250-248-2625

From: s.22
Sent: April 16, 2014 8:40 AM
To: Stilwell.MLA, Michelle
Subject: Civil Law in British Columbia: Laws without Enforcement

Dear Ms. Stilwell

My name is s.22 I am a resident of your constituency, and voted there in the last provincial election.

Two years ago s.22 passed away and left s.22 as the beneficiaries of his estate. s.22 at the time. s.22 as the estate executor. s.22

s.22

I have now engaged the services of a lawyer to advise me on how to proceed. s.22 s.22

My lawyer tells me that s.22 will be required to "pass the accounts" of the estate at some point before the whole estate process can conclude and before funds can be dispersed. However, he has told me that there is no way of compelling an

executor to pass the accounts of an estate, or to perform any of their other duties, for that matter, without resorting to litigation. The same situation applies if I refuse to accept the accounts presented to me. Litigation is also the only means by which a person can have an executor removed. My lawyer has advised me that such a process will cost between \$10,000 and \$30,000.

When I began to have difficulties with this executor, I assumed that the BC government must have some sort of body that oversees the activities of an executor and compels the executor to perform his or her duties. I had also assumed that such a government body would also be a place where I could report an executor for not performing these duties. To my amazement, however, no such body exists. As my lawyer put it: "Your sole remedy to an executor that will not comply with their duties is the court system."

It seems to me that the legal system in this province, and likely in others, has been set up to protect the interests of executors and not beneficiaries. It seems to me that, so long as the beneficiaries lack the funds to go through litigation, the executor has free reign to whatever he wants with no oversight. Furthermore, I have found this legal system to be incredibly inaccessible. Apparently, ordinary people can only navigate through it with the costly assistance of a lawyer. This is a system that ensures that executors can be reckless if they so choose, that lawyers continue to be highly paid, and that only the rich can afford to seek justice. In this estate system, there seems to be a blatant disregard for the very people for whom estates are originally created: the beneficiaries.

I am writing you today because I want your government to create some kind of body that oversees the estate process through to its completion and ensures that all parties involved live up to their legal responsibilities. Of critical importance is that this system is accessible to beneficiaries and that beneficiaries would not need a lawyer in order to use it. This seems like a basic requirement in a legal system, for what good are laws if they cannot be enforced? From what my lawyer has told me, there are certain legal obligations for executors, there just isn't any way to enforce them outside of court. This seems ridiculous to me. If someone commits a crime against me, I don't have to take them to court to report what they have done. I report crimes to the police and they investigate the matter. Who are the police when civil laws are broken? The answer is no one, and this ensures that only the only people who can have civil justice are those who can afford it. This needs to change.

Thanks for reading my message. I hope you'll take this into consideration, and ideally into the legislature some day.

Sincerely,

s.22

Subject: FW: My story regarding family law

-----Original Message-----

From: Fisher, Cindy L [mailto:Cindy.Fisher@leg.bc.ca]
Sent: April-23-14 11:07 AM
To: Ives, Andrew JAG:EX
Subject: FW: My story regarding family law

Hi Andrew, any suggestions on what, if anything, I can do for this constituent?

Cindy Fisher
Constituency Assistant
Mike Bernier, MLA - Peace River South
103B 1100 Alaska Avenue, Dawson Creek, BC, V1G 4V8
Phone: 250-782-3430
Toll Free: 1-855-582-3430
Fax: 250-782-6454

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The contents of this electronic message are confidential and strictly reserved for the use of its intended recipients. If you receive this message in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original message as well as copies. Any disclosure, copying, distributing or reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

-----Original Message-----

From: s.22
Sent: April 16, 2014 12:21 PM
To: Bernier.MLA, Mike
Subject: My story regarding family law

Good morning Mr. Bernier

I was talking with s.22 and he let me know that you wanted to hear a bit of how my experience regarding family law has gone up to this date.

s.22

s.22 My council at the time (along with s.22 council) decided and assured me that it would be better for everyone involved if we took this case to the Supreme Court rather than provincial as it would be dealt with in a much timelier fashion but would be a little more costly. Everybody involved agreed to move the case to Supreme Court.

Our lawyers went back and forth with emails, trial dates, affidavits, etc.

s.22

s.22 Mediation took place mid November 2012.

Our initial trial date that we were given was December 2012. This date was adjourned due to a criminal matter taking priority and other family law cases that involve expert witnesses also taking priority. s.22 Supreme Court works on an assize system and what I understand that meaning to be is "they overbook" dates and hope that some cases get resolved without having to go to court. The other cases that don't get resolved (like mine) are adjourned.

After this date was adjourned, I was given another, set for August 2013. Again, this date was adjourned for the same reasons as before. I was then given another date for trial to begin in January 2014. This date, yet again was adjourned. Since then I have been given a July 2014 date for trial to begin and I am sceptical that this will happen. Each time before trial we have has to prepare as if it will go ahead. Every time this has cost me a substantial amount of money for nothing.

s.22

s.22
support
won't do anything without a court order. s.22

I have yet to go to court. I do not have anything court ordered regarding child
I can't take this to family maintenance because they

s.22

I have been in the family law system for 2 years and 4 months now,
with no answers as I was 2 and a half years ago when we separated.

s.22

and still am in the same place

Sent fro my iPhone

Subject: FW: FMEP

From: Sturdy.MLA, Jordan <Jordan.Sturdy.MLA@leg.bc.ca>
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 2:28 PM
To: Ives, Andrew JAG:EX
Subject: FW: FMEP

Hello Andrew,

I am just wondering if you can give me a little more perspective on this constituents issues so I can better director her. I am in the office today, if you care to call.

Thank you.

Sharon Thompson
Constituency Assistant to
Jordan Sturdy, MLA, West Vancouver-Sea to Sky
6392 Bay Street
West Vancouver, BC V7W 2G9
Ph. 604-922-1153 Fax 604-922-1167

Confidentiality Warning: This message and any attachments are intended only for the use of the intended recipient(s), are confidential and may be privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, retransmission, conversion to hard copy, copying, circulation or other use of this message and any attachments is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail, and delete this message and any attachments from your system. Thank you.

From: s.22
Sent: April 25, 2014 1:29 PM
To: Sturdy.MLA, Jordan
Subject: FMEP

Dear Mr. Strudy,

s.22

s.22

After my very long winded explanation of my situation, I am writing to you because FMEP is a government funded program that I believe is failing the people who need it the most. I find it very frustrating that, every time I contact them I get the same response that "my case is due to come for review soon", or "that they are taking the enforcement action they see fit". I have explained to them that the actions they are taking are having no affect on him. I am not sure what, if anything you can do to help me, I am just reaching out to anyone who will listen to try and get my kids what they deserve. I will never give up for my children,

s.22

s.22

Thank you very much for taking the time to read my story. I apologize for the length, but I believe that it is necessary to make the story clear so that you can see where I am coming from.

s.22

Subject: FW: Family Maintenance Enforcement Program
Attachments: s.22

From: Ward, Debbie <Debbie.Ward@leg.bc.ca>
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 3:07 PM
To: Ives, Andrew JAG:EX
Subject: Family Maintenance Enforcement Program

Dear Andrew,

I have a constituent s.22 who is asking what can she do to ensure that her ex-husband will accurately report his earnings to the FMEP in the next 60 days for his appeal . s.22
Attached are her consent and a letter describing the situation.

Debbie Ward
Constituency Assistant to Scott Hamilton MLA
Delta North
8350 112th Ave. Delta, BC, V4C 7A2
604 597 1488