

HUMAN RIGHTS TRIBUNAL OF ONTARIO - COMPLAINT

An application was submitted to the HRTO on April 26, 2022 by Brenda Overall, referred to herein as the Applicant. The HRTO accepted the application, subsequently assigned by the HRTO as file #2022-49223-I.

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1C2DrCbFEhWVotMHIAgUhodxg-yvR3iN_/view?usp=sharing
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1FvcF1f6vnX3LB2FK_ej0K-FCsS9QA1bA/edit?usp=sharing&oid=108962640700994508092&rtpof=true&sd=true

On Friday June 3, the Applicant received a Notice of Summary Preliminary Hearing, from the HRTO, in relation to file #2018-32832-I, a former, completely unrelated matter to HRTO file #2022-49223-I

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1H-doSnOcDaKdij3JAGnbDG9cuLBuaxxg/view?usp=sharing>

File #2018-32832-I relates to the Applicant's allegations of harassment and subsequent discrimination by a former landlord, herein referred to as the Respondent(s). The Respondent(s) became hostile when the Applicant chose not to renew a rental agreement due to poor property management protocols and serious breaches of the rental agreement by the alleged property manager. The Applicant had not sought accountability from the Respondent(s), but rather only to cut her losses, terminate the rental agreement and move out of the rental unit without issue.

In return, the Respondent(s) made inaccurate, unfair and unsupported allegations about the Applicant that the Respondent(s) failed to raise before the Applicant declined the offer to renew the rental agreement. Let it be known, actually, that the Respondent(s) had, by their own free will, invited the Applicant to renew the rental agreement just prior to being politely and properly informed that the Applicant was declining such.

With this understanding, and in the absence of the Respondent(s) taking any proactive steps to formally deal with any alleged allegations against the Applicant, it becomes astonishingly clear that allegations made by the Respondent(s) to suggest that the Applicant was, in any way, a bad or irresponsible tenant, are absolutely frivolous and purely vexatious.

The matter of what sort of tenant the Applicant was or wan't, at any rate, is completely irrelevant to the proceedings. The matter before the Tribunal is very simple and straightforward - the Applicant was denied a mandated service, based on the applicant's disability. No amount of procedural distraction or attempts to put the applicant on trial can change those basic facts that the HRTO must acknowledge and accept!

The Respondent(s) refused to provide a rent receipt to the Applicant upon a request for such and contrary to Ontario Residential Tenancy Act. Willfully denying a mandated service to the Applicant, after the Applicant clearly requested such, constitutes a clearly demonstrated act of discrimination.

The Respondent(s) indicated that a rent receipt would only be provided upon receipt of the contact information for the Applicant's disability caseworker. Obviously, at that point, the Applicant was being coerced, an unlawful act under the Criminal Code of Canada, to meet the arbitrary demands of the disgruntled Respondent(s).

The Respondent(s) obviously linked the act of discrimination to the prohibited ground of disability and receipt of social services attached to the Applicant's disability, by their very own volition. The Applicant was not prepared to facilitate the arrogant, unlawful demand from the Respondent(s) to become involved in the Applicant's personal, private medical affairs, simply to avoid unfair, differential treatment by the Respondent(s).

Therefore; because the Applicant was unwilling to comply with the arbitrary demand to supply the Respondent(s) with unnecessary, personal and private information, the Respondent(s), true to their word, never did provide a rent receipt to the Applicant, even after the HRTO proceedings were initiated. This one occurrence, in itself, whereby the Applicant was denied a rent receipt, clearly demonstrates discrimination based on the prohibited ground of disability. The pattern of harassment and subsequent discrimination created a poisoned environment whereby the Applicant was left with no viable option to resolve contractual issues with the Respondent(s).

Several avenues of legal accountability were available to the Respondent(s) in response to allegations made against the Applicant. Instead of following legal avenues to allegedly desired accountability against the Applicant, the Respondent(s) chose, instead, to target the Applicant with false, offensive allegations and a subsequent refusal to supply a mandated, imperative service.

At any rate, a hearing in the matter of file #2018-32832-I was originally scheduled to take place on December 4, 2019. By November 2019, the Applicant was in serious crisis whereby she became extremely ill, subsequently losing access to many essential resources essential to basic living, leaving her with nowhere safe to live for the winter months.

Without a rent receipt to indicate where the Applicant had recently lived and confirmation that the Applicant had actually paid rent to a landlord, amid other complicating factors, securing housing in the Applicant's hometown became literally impossible, especially in the midst of a housing crisis.

The Applicant was put up in a motel in Belleville Ontario, paid for as an emergency service by Belleville Community Trust until the Applicant could eventually settle into the long-term housing that was eventually secured in the city of Belleville.

As such, even though all parties in the matter had been communicating via email, the Applicant sent a notice out to the HRTO and to the legal counsel for the Respondent(s) via Canada Post. The Applicant informed the parties that she was extremely incapacitated and that she was requesting that tribunal proceedings be halted and subsequently rescheduled due to the crisis that the Applicant was experiencing, especially since the crisis was, from the Applicant's

perspective, partially owing to the effects of the discrimination and harassment that the Applicant experienced from the Respondent(s).

The Applicant's personal issues were extremely compounded and the Applicant and her son found themselves in a profound, unprecedented crisis at that particular point in time. The Applicant was severely ill and subsequently incapacitated in various ways. From that point on, a global pandemic was allegedly unfolding making it all the more difficult for the Applicant to overcome her compounded personal issues.

The Applicant never heard another thing back from the HRTO, the Respondent(s) or the legal counsel for the Respondent(s). The Applicant was far too sick and otherwise overwhelmed to inquire about the case thereon and the matters eventually fell to the wayside... until recently.

How this current, unresolved human rights case became altogether abandoned in the first place and then subsequently reactivated again is an absolute mystery to the Applicant. Apparently, the legal counsel for the Respondent(s) is perplexed by the matter as well. On July 26, 2022 the Applicant received a submission from the legal Counsel for the Respondent(s), informing the Applicant of updated case law submissions that will be relied on for the Hearing on August 9, 2022. The updated case law submissions pertain to the application being out of time.

Thus; it appears that the legal counsel for the Respondent(s) is preparing to seek a justification for the timing of the proceedings, which the Applicant, herself, has recently sought to understand. The HRTO is being vague and subsequently unfair, to the Applicant and to the Respondent(s), from the Applicant's perspective.

Surely, the legal counsel for the Respondent(s) will make the argument for procedural unfairness, relying on the notion that file #2018-32832/ is *potentially out of time*. Yet, the Applicant will firmly assert that;the Application was originally made within the one year period and since a Hearing is now scheduled, the rules of procedure must be adhered to by the parties and that an argument for Application disposal is invalid in any context.

The Applicant is very frustrated, perplexed and upset with the proceedings in relation to file #2018-32832/. In all honesty, the Applicant feels that the HRTO is potentially attempting to gas-light her, or to otherwise upset her life, in response to her most recent Application to the HRTO against the CAS.

After nearly two and a half years, the HRTO has arbitrarily decided to initiate a Summary/Preliminary Hearing for file #2018-32832/, in the absence of any sound explanation, whatsoever. This unusual situation is causing the Applicant unnecessary stress and subsequent anxiety. Prolonged or intense stress can cause life-threatening reactions for the Applicant and the HRTO must immediately recognize and respect this fact!

The Applicant is a whistle-blower against CAS crimes and subsequently claims to be a targeted individual of covert gang-stalking in return. In fact, the Applicant, as a whistle-blower against

corruption in Ontario/Canada, has recently requested service from the Integrity Commissioner of Canada in response to the oppression and tyranny that she experiences

The Applicant is concerned that the HRTO has reactivate dfile #2018-32832/ to potentially cause problems for the Applicant in her hometown community where, due to an incredible smear campaign against the Applicant, slander and hearsay about her tend to run rampant.

At the Summary/Preliminary Hearing, the Applicant will strongly argue, among other facts, that she has a right to a dignified response when summoned by any Tribunal in Canada, or anywhere else in the world for that matter, and that she has the right to fully participate in Tribunal proceedings, according to the rules of the Tribunal despite any argument the legal counsel for the Respondent(s) may present. .

The Applicant will insistently assert, too, that the HRTO scheduled a hearing and that the onus is now on the HRTO to, somehow, strike a balance in respecting the rights of both the Applicant and the Respondent(s). It's the Applicant's opinion that the HRTO is legally liable, to both the Applicant and the Respondent(s), for procedural unfairness and potential damages and/or adversities generated by such.

From the Applicant's perspective, the Respondent(s) contributed to an extreme, preventable crisis in her life that seriously affected the quality of her long-term overall health and the subsequent quality of her life in general. The adversities caused to the Applicant by the direct discrimination of the Respondent(s) weren't disclosed in the Application made in 2018 because the adverse effects hadn't yet occurred.

The Applicant has not updated the Application to reflect the effects of the discrimination because she is still extremely incapacitated in many ways. Also, the Applicant feels that by sticking to the facts of the original disclosure, further confusion and potential complications in these particular proceedings are avoided

The point is that; now that the proceedings have resumed before the Tribunal, for whatever reason(s), the Applicant most certainly has all intentions of seeing the matter through to a final, fair resolution.

As sympathetic as the Applicant is to the the Respondent(s) being potentially adversity affected by these highly unusual and extremely convoluted matters, the Applicant simply isn't interested in having the current proceedings against the Respondent(s) disposed of even if procedural unfairness is adversely affecting the Respondent(s). The Respondent(s), if inclined to obtain actual justice and accountability, can chase after such, just as the Applicant and so many others in Canada are forced to do when wronged by the corrupt system.

Had the Respondent(s) acted with integrity and by the basic tenets of equity when it first mattered, the Respondent(s) wouldn't have ended up being in the center of a potentially high profile human rights case at this particular point in time. The applicant, herself, does not

understand what prompted this particular human rights case to resurface but In the Applicant's experience, it would seem that karma comes around when least expected for which the Applicant certainly can't be blamed!

With that being said, the Applicant has no faith that the proceedings will, in any way, go in her favor. The Applicant merely intends to go through the motions, creating a public record of evidence that, in the Applicant's opinion, will speak for itself, in due time.

Frankly, the Applicant has lost all faith in the integrity of the HRTO, especially after the HRTO's attempt to dispose of her last Application that clearly details the corruption that is unfolding in Canada, particularly within the child protection industry.

The Applicant has noticed a pattern with the HRTO in that it tends to respond to Applications by first attempting to claim that the Application is out of time or jurisdiction. If the Applicant successfully manages to keep the Application alive, the HRTO usually facilitates a Summary Hearing whereby the Application is, once again, challenged and potentially disposed of. From the Applicant's perspective, it appears that the HRTO attempts to dispose of valid human rights cases on any technicality possible. In this way, fair and reasonable access to justice becomes thwarted!

At any rate, upon receiving the updated case law list from the legal counsel for the Respondent(s) on July 26, 2022, the Applicant emailed the HRTO that same day with an inquiry that reads as follows;

"I received confirmation that my application was received on April 26, 2022 whereby case number 2022-49223-I was subsequently assigned to the file.

I was directed, by the HRTO, to wait for further instruction before contacting the HRTO, however; months are passing by and I haven't received such direction, nor have I received a response from the respondents.

I seek to learn the current status of my application as soon as possible.

Subsequently, I seek to be advised as to why file number 2018-32832I (Everall/Coens) from 2019 was reactivated after I filed the most recent application (2022-49223-I). I have been summoned by the HRTO to attend a hearing on August 8 , 2022 and I'm very confused as to why a hearing is occurring at this particular point in time. (Notice of typo error in this particular paragraph. I stated that the hearing is on the 8th in my correspondence to the HRTO but the correct date is actually the 9th)

There seems to be deviation from standard protocol occurring in my matters which I request a prompt and thorough explanation for. I'm requesting a respectful response as an accommodation for my disability which is being exasperated by stress at this current time.

**Thank you,
Brenda Everall”**

_____END_____

On August 3, 2022, the Applicant received the following notice, via email, from the HRTO;

“Re: Brenda Everall v. Highland Shores Children's Aid Society, Michael Evans and Lisa Mascherin

Subject: Notice of Intent to Dismiss

An adjudicator has reviewed your Application, Human Rights Tribunal of Ontario (HRTO) file 2022-49223-I, filed on April 26, 2022, and determined that as filed your Application appears to be outside the HRTO’s jurisdiction for the following reasons:

- The Application fails to set out a coherent narrative that explains the particulars of the alleged discrimination and discloses a basis on which the applicant’s allegations are connected to the Code and to the respondent(s). To be able to make a determination that the Application is within the Tribunal’s jurisdiction, the HRTO requires a concise statement from the applicant that clearly describes each incident of alleged discrimination in chronological order, including the date, place and people involved. This statement must be no more than five (5) pages long.**
- While your response to question #7 of the Application alleges that the last incident of discrimination you experienced occurred on May 13, 2021, it is either not clear what incident of discrimination is alleged to have occurred on this date or how the incident described as occurring on that date constitutes an incident of discrimination within the meaning of the Code. See for example *Miller v. Prudential Lifestyles Real Estate*, 2009 HRTO 1241 (CanLII); *Mafinezam v. University of Toronto*, 2010 HRTO 1495 (CanLII); and *Garrie v. Janus Joan Inc.*, 2012 HRTO 1955.**

The HRTO does not have the power to consider claims filed more than one year after the last incident of discrimination or the last in a series of incidents of discrimination unless the delay in filing was incurred in good faith and no substantial prejudice will result to any person affected by the delay [s.34(1)]. You do not appear to have cited facts that constitute “good faith” within the meaning of the HRTO’s case law. See for example *Thomas v. Toronto Transit Commission*, 2009 HRTO 1582 (CanLII) and see for example *Diler v. Cambridge Memorial Hospital*, 2010 HRTO 1224 (CanLII) for a discussion of “good faith”.

2

- A review of the Application and the narrative setting out the incidents of alleged**

discrimination fails to identify any specific acts of discrimination within the meaning of the Code allegedly committed by the respondent(s). The Tribunal does not have jurisdiction over general allegations of unfairness unless the unfairness is connected, in whole or in part, to one of the grounds specifically set out in Part I of the Code (e.g. race, disability, sex, etc.); see, for example, *Forde v. Elementary Teachers' Federation of Ontario*, 2011 HRTO 1389).

• The Application does not allege that any of the rights of the applicant have been infringed and the Application is not made on behalf of another person or persons pursuant to s. 34(5) of the Code: see *Oliphant v. Ontario (Attorney General)*, 2009 HRTO 1902 (CanLII) and *Freitag v. Penetanguishene (Municipality)*, 2010 HRTO 1704 (CanLII).

Rule 13 of the HRTO's Rules of Procedure and Section 4.6 of the Statutory Powers Procedure Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. S.22 (the "SPPA") require the HRTO to send you this Notice setting out the adjudicator's jurisdictional concerns regarding your Application and informing you of your right to make written submissions to the HRTO about it. You must provide written submissions responding to the issues identified above by September 2, 2022.

If you do not respond to this notice and file written submissions by the deadline noted, the HRTO will consider your failure to respond as an abandonment of your Application and dismiss your Application.

When the HRTO receives your submissions, an adjudicator will consider them and the HRTO will take one of the following actions:

- Dismiss your Application, in whole or in part, for one of the reasons described above;**
- Allow your Application to continue on in the HRTO's process without making any decision as to whether it will ultimately succeed or not; or**
- Request additional information.**

Whatever the adjudicator decides, the HRTO will notify you in writing of the decision. Before responding to this Notice, you may wish to review the provisions of the Human Rights Code noted above as well as the HRTO's Rules of Procedure and Guides to its processes, all available on the HRTO's website at <https://tribunalsontario.ca/hrto/contact/>. HRTO decisions can be accessed free of charge through the Canadian Legal Information Institute (CanLII) at www.canlii.org.

E-mail is the fastest way to get your submissions to the HRTO so the HRTO seeks to use it as much as possible. If you do not have the ability to send us your submissions by email, you can mail or courier them to the address on the letterhead of this Notice. Please

clearly write your name and your HRTO file number on all correspondence and any other documents you file with the HRTO.

3

HRTO staff cannot provide legal advice or assist you in completing forms or making submissions to the HRTO. If you need legal assistance or advice, contact the Human Rights

Legal Support Centre at 180 Dundas Street West, 8th Floor, Toronto, ON M7A 0A1 or by phone toll free at 1-866-625-5179, in Toronto 416-597-4900 or TTY toll free at 1-866-612-8627 or TTY in Toronto 416-597-4903, Fax: 416-597-4901, toll free 1-866-625-5180. Website: www.hrlsc.on.ca.

**Sincerely,
Office of the Registrar
Human Rights Tribunal of Ontario”
_____END_____**

The Applicant will absolutely respond to the Notice of Intent to Dismiss. In the interim, the Applicant is initiating a complaint about the services that she is receiving from the HRTO.

Additionally, the Applicant is requesting accommodation for her disability, to the point of HRTO undue hardship, at this time. Stress and oppression, naturally, exacerbate the Applicant's existing health condition. It's imperative that HRTO assist to reduce or to eliminate any stress for the applicant, wherever possible, by ensuring the absolute restriction of censorship and/or oppressive responses to the Applicant. In moving forward, the Applicant requires and subsequently requests; prompt and clear communications from the HRTO that respect the Applicant's dignity and equity.

A Hearing in the matter of file #2018-32832-I is scheduled for August 9, 2022 which, at this point, is one day away. The HRTO has failed to respond to the Applicant's request for information about the matter. Therefore, the Applicant is sending this particular document as part of a complaint procedure to the HRTO. By the time the Applicant finishes the draft it will be late in the evening and the Applicant will therefore send this complaint to the HRTO in the morning of August 9, 2022, just before the scheduled hearing.

The Applicant will attend the scheduled Hearing on August 9, 2022 in response to the summons issued by the HRTO on June 3, 2022. Although the Applicant originally filed within the one year deadline, clearly linking a discriminatory act to a prohibited ground, the HRTO is still considering the potential disposal of the Application.

How the Hearing will go, especially in the absence of any concise understanding about why the matter is even proceeding at this point, is anyone's guess. The Applicant can only assume that

the legal counsel for the Respondent(s) will attempt to have the matter disposed of as soon as possible. Still, the Applicant will state her case and, if necessary, have the matter reviewed accordingly.

Considering that the Respondent(s) and/or the legal counsel for the Respondent(s) may or may not be in obligation to the Masonic fraternity or another clandestine society, fraternity or order and considering also that the same may be true of HRTO staff members, there may very well be elements of collusion at play in these matters that potentially prevent actual justice from occurring.

From the Applicant's perspective, there is a social epidemic in Canada where various public/civil servants and regulated professionals have sworn clandestine oaths in obligation to publicly unaccountable, non-transparent entities, such as the Masonic fraternity. When public/civil servants and regulated professionals put themselves in obligation to clandestine entities, the apparent conflict of interest that is generated becomes evident. Serving the public with a conflict of interest is unlawful in Ontario, Canada - for a very good reason!

As the old adage goes, one can not possibly serve two masters!

When the Applicant attends the Hearing on August 9, 2022, she will ask all parties to declare any apparent or real conflict of interest that they may have as civil servants and/or regulated professionals. If a conflict of interest is declared by any party, the Applicant will request an adjournment until that matter can be effectively resolved. If a conflict of interest is declared to not exist, the Applicant will be content to move forward with the understanding that she can take action against parties who potentially conceal an apparent or actual conflict of interest if such should be discovered in the future.

The Applicant alleges that the HRTO, itself, is corrupt. The Applicant is of this mindset because she has been through the HRTO process before where the HRTO protected a Presbyterian minister, known as Deanne Lynne Donovan. Rev. Donovan was outright discriminating against the Applicant and subsequently oppressing her for her attempts to expose one of the Reverend's community partners, the CAS.

<https://www.canlii.org/en/on/onhrt/doc/2016/2016hrto957/2016hrto957.html?autocompleteStr=EVERALL%20V.%20DO&autocompletePos=1>

The Applicant wrote to Richard Hennessy, the HRTO Registrar at that time, alleging that HRTO proceedings were corrupted in the Applicant's matters before the HRTO at that time. The Registrar, to the best of the Applicant's knowledge, did not even bother to respond to the notice of corrupt proceedings.

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B63Xx95wbyCvMFIwdnV5c3d5MEFNY2IULW1GY3RfRXpFS3NR/view?usp=sharing&resourcekey=0-PMzRFrptR6usJHAlvYPDmg>

The adjudicator in the matter disposed of the case as quickly as possible, as per the request of the Reverend's legal counsel. The whole process was quite revealing, to the Applicant at least,

about the genuine nature of the HRTO and who/what it actually seeks to protect. From the Applicant's perspective, the HRTO is a provincial control mechanism that serves the so-called elite over the common people of Ontario.

The Applicant insists that a qualified staff member of the HRTO, who is not serving in their current position with an apparent or actual conflict of interest, perform an investigation into the matters that the Applicant is submitting to the HRTO as a complaint, at this current time.

The Applicant requests that, in addition to statements made above, the following particular statements and questions are taken into consideration as the complaint is investigated by a qualified HRTO staff member;

1. How and why did file #2018-32832I reactivate after the Applicant submitted a completely separate and totally unrelated application under file # 2022-49223-I on April 26, 2022?
2. What is the name of the adjudicator who sent me the Notice of Intent to Dismiss file #2022-49223-I?
3. There is no signature from the HRTO Registrar on the recent Notice of Intent to Dismiss.
4. Why is the signature Registrar's signature absent from the Notice?
5. Is the Registrar actually aware of what's currently unfolding with file #2022-49223-I?
6. Discrimination has been outlined, with significant detail in the application related to file #2022-49223-I and yet the adjudicator is arbitrarily making demands that seem to be abusing the administrative process. What policy or guidelines did the adjudicator follow in reaching his/her decision about requiring more information about file #2022-49223-I?
7. What policy or guidelines did the adjudicator rely on to set the deadline for a response to the Notice of Intent to Dismiss relating to file #2022-49223-I?
8. It took the HRTO over three (3) months to decide to attempt to dismiss file #2022-49223-I. What policy or guidelines were followed to justify the timing of this decision?
9. What formula or test was relied on to ensure fair, equitable service from the preliminary adjudication process in relation to file #2022-49223-I?
10. How was the decision reached that allows for my response to the Notice of Intent to Dismiss to be limited to five (5) pages in relation to file #2022-49223-I?
11. As far as the Applicant is/was concerned, the statements that she submitted to the HRTO in her application were as concise as possible given the volume of information and the confusing nature of her matters of concern. What rule is being used to determine that the Applicant's submissions in relation to file #2022-49223-I have to be more concise than they currently are?
12. In relation to file #2022-49223-I, the CAS had a duty to provide a mandated service to the Applicant. The Applicant requested accommodation for her disability. Subsequent to the Applicant's request, the CAS refused to accommodate her and subsequently refused to provide mandated services by closing the service file. This is called prime facie discrimination.
13. If the adjudicator is unable to perceive a case of clear discrimination in the matter of file #2022-49223-I should he/she actually be trusted to make judgment calls on other cases that come before the HRTO?

14. The adjudicator alleges that file #2022-49223-I may possibly be out of time to succeed. The CAS denied the Applicant fair service and subsequently closed the file on the specific date that is referenced in the application. The Applicant filed well within the one-year deadline thereafter. The adjudicator, from the perspective of the Applicant, is being frivolous and vexatious with claims that the application is potentially out of time or outside of the jurisdiction of the HRTO.
15. In the Notice of Intent to Dismiss in relation to file #2022-49223-I, the anonymous adjudicator said; "You do not appear to have cited facts that constitute "good faith" within the meaning of the HRTO's case law", subsequently attaching two citations for case law below that particular statement. When the Applicant accessed the referenced case law, she found case law pertaining to applications being out of time with no reference(s), whatsoever, about statements made in 'good faith.' What case law is the anonymous adjudicator referring to about HRTO case law and good faith and where can the Applicant be directed to find such? The statement about good faith by the anonymous adjudicator requires further clarification. What specific statements in the application were not in good faith, from the adjudicators perspective?
16. Over the course of three (3) months, the anonymous adjudicator generated four (4) weak points that are currently stalling the application for file #2022-49223-I from proceeding according to the rules of the HRTO. The adjudicator took no issue with the rest of the statements made in the application. Does the HRTO, then, accept the majority of the information in the application as a valid, truthful, unchallenged submission?
17. Does the adjudicator have an apparent or actual conflict of interest while serving the general public in their role as an employee of the HRTO, such as being in obligation to clandestine fraternity, order, club or organization?
18. The Applicant has had more than enough of the corruption that is occurring in Ontario and throughout all of Canada and North America. From the Applicant's perspective, there can be no doubt that she is being censored and subsequently oppressed by the human rights tribunal of Ontario!
19. The Applicant alleges that the HRTO is conspiring against her and that members of the HRTO are in potential collusion to stifle her voice and her subsequent human rights.
20. The masonic jig is up! It's only a matter of time, from the Applicant's perspective, before what's being exposed with file #2022-49223-I is known by a much wider audience. It's the applicant's opinion that the general public will be beyond outraged when the truth about Canada and its incredible human rights violations become known as an undisputable matter of fact. HRTO staff can only be encouraged to govern themselves accordingly as I, and others in Canada, bring accountability to the deceitful, tyrannical lovers of Yahweh and the subsequent devastation that they're wreaking throughout the entire earth at this point in time.
21. The HRTO must respect and enforce the rights of the Applicant and the rights of all Ontarians against religious persecution, oppression and tyranny. Allegations of said persecution, oppression and tyranny are laid out as a secondary claim within my application. What steps is the HRTO currently taking to safeguard the rights of Ontarians against the religious tyranny of the Crown and other potential rival factions of biblical tribes/families?

I, the Applicant, expect a response within 15 days.

Thank you for the time, attention and patience required to effectively address the nature and details of this complaint.

Kindest regards,
Brenda Everall
brendaeverall@gmail.com