

SEPTEMBER 2, 2022

HRT0 File #2022-49223-I

Brenda Overall V. Highland Shores Children's Aid Society, Micheal Evans and Lisa Mascherin

RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF INTENT TO DISMISS

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

1. If the adjudicator in this matter is bound by a professional code of ethics and also in obligation to a criminal, clandestine order such as the protestant masonic fraternity, the Orange Order, (etc.) or Catholic orders such as the knights of St. John or Malta (etc.), the adjudicator has generated a conflict of interest in their duties, requiring their immediate removal from this case and subsequent resignation from the HRT0. If the adjudicator doesn't have a conflict of interest to declare, please see, below, my response to the Notice of Intent to Dismiss for the Application associated with file #2022-49223-I

STATEMENTS OF RESPONSE

2. The application does not fail to set out a coherent narrative. In fact, the narrative was purposefully laid out to clearly state the facts and to minimize confusion. It's unfortunate and subsequently concerning that the adjudicator finds it difficult to interpret basic facts and statements.
3. Nevertheless, as the adjudicator requires a more concise narrative to make a determination, I'll make the matters perfectly concise, here and now;
 - a) Michael Evans and the Highland Shores Children's Aid Society (HSCAS) were mandated, by law, to provide imperative service to me and to a child in my care.
 - b) On April 26, I clearly informed Michael Evans and the HSCAS that I was alleging that Michael Evans and the HSCAS were directly discriminating against me. I subsequently insisted on fair service and further requested accommodation for my disability.
 - c) I clearly informed Michael Evans and the HSCAS that I was being discriminated against as the HSCAS was not following the rule of law while arbitrarily denying fair and prompt service to me and to my family members.
 - d) Instead of appropriately responding to serious allegations of professional misconduct and a continuous and obvious breach of my human rights, Michael Evans and the HSCAS decided to heighten the discrimination by outright denying service to me and arbitrarily closing my service file, contrary to the Child, Youth and Family Services Act, the Criminal Code of Canada, HSCAS policy as well as the Ontario Human Rights code and supporting legislation.
 - e) For the record, all occurrences were in Belleville, Ontario. Most of the communications between myself and Michael Evans occurred over the telephone or via email. Michael Evans only attended my home once. Beyond that, we did not speak to each other in person at any point.

4. In the Notice of Intent to Dismiss, the adjudicator informs that “you do not appear to have cited facts that constitute ‘good faith’, within the meaning of the HRTO’s case law.” The Adjudicator then attached reference to various case law. I require clarification from the adjudicator about what statements I made that were considered to be contrary to good faith and what the supporting case law offered by the adjudicator was supposed to indicate in relation to statements of good faith.
5. My response to question 7 is quite clear. Still, I’ll reiterate the obvious timeline to make it undeniably clear. Micheal Evans, Lisa Mascherin and the HSCAS last discriminated against me on May 13, 2021, via email, when outright denying me service and subsequently closing my service file, after I specifically asked for accommodation. I filed the application with the HRTO on April 26, 2022, well within the one year time limit to do so.
6. A specific act of discrimination occurred on May 13, 2021 when Michael Evans, Lisa Mascherin and the HSCAS denied fair and prompt service to me and a child in my care, subsequently closing my service file, leaving me and a child in need of protection in an extremely vulnerable position, at risk of pyhsical and emotional harm and significant financial demise. That discriminatory action occurred after I specifically requested accommodation for my disability and my unconventional family status. The CAS can not lawfully deny service to a child in need of protection. In breaking the law, and attempting to evade accountability, Michael Evans and the HSCAS simultaneously breached my human rights! There can be no doubt about this obviously glaring fact!
7. Secondary to that specific act of discrimination, evidence supports that CAS provides service to children and families in crisis, sometimes even by force. For the HSCAS to refuse service to me as the caregiver to a child who was in need of protection is obvious differential treatment which is a form of discrimination.
8. For the record, the gist of the reason that HSCAS outright discriminated against me is actually a form of reprisal because I exposed the Prince Edward County CAS (PECAS) for the Foster Care Sexual Abuse Scandal that it was engaged in. Before the PECAS became defunct, it amalgamated into the HSCAS where several former PECAS employees transferred to. I continued to advocate HSCAS accountability and subsequently exposed professional misconduct once again. In return, the HSCAS punished me and the child in my care by failing, or outright refusing, to provide mandated services to me. The child that came into my care was denied protection because he was in a parent-child relationship with me, a person that the HSCAS has a serious vendetta against. .
9. I understand that the HRTO doesn’t have jurisdiction over matters of general unfairness. I’m not attempting to resolve matters of unfairness, I’m attempting to resolve outright discrimination that was generated by a criminal organization that preys on Canadian children with very little, if any, actual accountability.
10. There is no lawful reason that the application should be disposed of. Instead, the application should immediately succeed based on the significant merit of the application that I’ve clearly reiterated at this time.
11. Prima facie discrimination is clearly established in this matter!

POST RESPONSE QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS

12. The assessment of my application and the subsequent arbitrary demand for clarification on tedious matters appear to be frivolous and potentially vexatious. Please follow the rules.
13. I have the right to know the name of the adjudicator that's deciding matters about my application. Please identify yourself at this time and also if/when you communicate with me in the future. .
14. I'm not attempting to establish several incidents of discrimination. To keep matters simple, I'm establishing one clear act of outrageous, obvious discrimination, all that's lawfully necessary to establish that discrimination occurred. Please refrain from convoluting simple matters.
15. I have serious concerns about your fitness to practice. What are your qualifications and how do I follow up with HRTTO oversight on your professional performance?
16. My rights have been clearly infringed. That the HRTTO seems more invested in protecting the HSCAS and its obvious malicious operations over HSCAS victims is beyond concerning!
17. I feel that the HRTTO, itself, is attempting to stifle my voice and my human rights while enabling an organization that's causing great harm to Ontario children, their families and society in general.
18. The facts are clear and obvious. It's time to do the right thing here. The HRTTO must cease and desist with abusing me, the applicant, and my rights!

CORRECTIONS TO SECONDARY COMPLAINT IN THE APPLICATION

I've made the claim that the Crown is not the person known as Queen Elizabeth II and I'd like to clarify what I mean by that. Legally, as we know, the Queen and the Crown are one in the same. Upon deeper inspection, however, we see that the Queen is a natural person taking on a legal persona.

Wikipedia informs that "While the Crown's legal personality is usually regarded as a corporation sole, it can, at least for some purposes, be described as a corporation aggregate, headed by the monarch."

"The monarch is the living embodiment of the Crown and, as such, is regarded as the personification of the state."

"The body of the reigning sovereign thus holds two distinct personas in constant coexistence: that of a natural-born human being and that of the state as accorded to him or her through law; the Crown and the monarch are "conceptually divisible but legally indivisible."

"Her Majesty the Queen in Right of and similar are all synonymous and the monarch's legal personality is sometimes referred to simply as the relevant jurisdiction's name. (In countries using systems of government derived from Roman civil law, the State is the equivalent concept to the Crown.)"

Wikipedia further indicates that; “this is all in his or her position as sovereign, not as an individual; all such property is held by the Crown in perpetuity and cannot be sold by the sovereign without the proper advice and consent of his or her relevant ministers.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Crown

So while Queen Elizabeth II is the legal embodiment of the Crown, the Crown itself is influenced by other entities. Therefore, I don't consider Elizabeth Windsor to be the sole decision-maker behind the Crown. With that being said, Queen Elizabeth II is, nevertheless, the representative of the Crown but it's certainly fair to say that there's undeniable deception occurring with how the 'corporation' of the Crown actually operates. .

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Crown

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Advice_and_consent

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Crown_Office

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Roll_of_the_Peerage

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lords_Spiritual

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lords_Temporal

It's interesting to note that the Supreme Court of Canada considers the concept of legal persons vs. natural persons to be pseudo-law that it refuses to take seriously. In fact, the court has arrogantly told the general public to 'enjoy the silence' while indicating that it won't respond to matters of pseudo-law. So, is the Supreme Court incorrectly interpreting what pseudo-law is or is the Crown illegitimate, I wonder?

<https://www.canlii.org/en/commentary/doc/2020CanLIIDocs498#!fragment/BQCwhgziBcwMYgK4DsDWszlQewE4BUBTADwBdoByCgSgBplTCIBFRQ3AT0otokLC4EbDtyp8BQkAGU8pAELcASgFEAMioBqAQQByAYRW1SYAEbRS2ONWpA>

From what I've recently come to understand, Queen Elizabeth II and her Roman Catholic allies are facilitating treason and various crimes against humanity but at the same time, so is the Protestant United States of America, whose radically religious history has gone unnoticed, for the most part, by the North American populace, throughout history. This particular document series aims to expose two major influences that facilitate world corruption - Protestantism and Roman Catholicism - and how those two influences relate to historical entities commonly known as the twelve tribes of Israel and, subsequently, how it all relates to the current oppression of the world's inhabitants.

When I set out to track the Crown, I didn't realize that I was employing far too many preconceived notions about how the corruption on the planet was actually operating. I still had much to learn when I began the research project to track the Crown and it's taken a lot of time to shatter my own paradigms so that I could accept the truth that research was revealing. I'm still learning and processing imperative information that tells the true history of Canada, so please bear with me as I try to relay imperative information that's critical to understanding how global oppression came to be and how it affects us all, collectively, today.

Initially, I thought that the horrible tyranny in Canada was coming from the Crown, which some of it is, without doubt. However; from my perspective, there's a far more nefarious entity coming into view according to what the research is revealing at this point.

I understand now, at least I believe that I do, that even though the Crown is absolutely corrupt and oppressive, the United States of America is currently a bigger potential threat to Canada and to the people of Canada than the Crown Empire currently is. If I'm correct in that assertion, Canadians will have to promptly respond to a takeover of Canada by the United States of America and, potentially, Nato and other armed forces.

Not so long ago, I was foolish enough to believe that I had laid out the basic, extremely confusing and convoluted evidence of the history of the Crown in Canada. I prematurely sent a document off to the Integrity Commissioner of Canada, various military officials, the Federation of Canadian municipalities, the Council of Premiers, Health Canada, various law societies and the Judicial Council. I also filed an application with the Human Rights Tribunal of Ontario (HRTO) whereby I made incorrect statements about the Crown and, subsequently, about how clandestine orders connected to one another.

I had incorrectly asserted that the particular Masonic degrees crossed over into the Sovereign Military Order of Malta (SMOM). The SMOM is under the protection of the Roman Catholic Pope and is in no way, to my knowledge, connected to Freemasonry. Freemasonry has its own order of Malta and I sincerely apologize for misleading anyone with the notion that the Masonic order of Malta was, in any way, related to the Catholic order of Malta.

Although I was wrong in some instances about how the Crown or clandestine orders are fundamentally operating, I believe that the gist of my submissions were overall correct, or let's say correct enough, to prompt what should have been a concerned response from Canada's officials and the HRTO.

I called out treason, genocide and crimes against humanity to several of these parties. Instead of any sort of response, whatsoever, most of the parties have silently acquiesced allegations that genocide, crimes against humanity and a general takeover of Canada is currently unfolding. I guess the finer details that I had gotten wrong didn't really matter to the addressed parties as they didn't care to refute one single point made. Now that I've corrected myself I've sent an updated document to the parties who are silently acquiescing to the claims of shadow governments and conspiracy operating in Canada. Additionally, I'll inform the HRTO about corrections to the secondary complaint of my application..

I'm attempting to amend the HRTO application but it seems that the means to do so has changed. In the interim, clarification for the purposes of the Application can be accessed below. <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Bgi152Vnyzvrntej5v5XMYoMammEx6rkhDe9HcaDII8/edit?usp=sharing>

Sincerely
Brenda Overall