

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

FILE # 2022-49223-I

2023 HRT0 1550

Everall v. Highland Shores Children's Aid Society

November 23, 2023

LEGAL QUESTIONS:

- Was the application out of time or jurisdiction?
- Was prima facie discrimination established by the applicant?
- Was the question of timeliness or jurisdiction answered in a manner that followed HRT0 rules?
- Was the adjudicator in this matter acting with an undeclared conflict of interest?
- Was the adjudicator in this matter acting in good faith towards the applicant?
- Why didn't the applicant receive a Response to the Application?
- Why didn't the applicant receive notice of a preliminary hearing?
The applicant was willing and prepared to speak to the issues of timeliness, jurisdiction and general unfairness vs. unlawful discrimination at a hearing should it have become necessary. Why wasn't the applicant afforded an opportunity to do so if a genuine question of jurisdiction or timeliness actually existed?
- Why did it take 18 months to establish the timeliness and/or jurisdiction of the Application? Is this the usual procedural time frame at the HRT0?
- Why were the applicant's complaints about procedural unfairness never taken seriously by the HRT0 prior to the final decision?
- Why did the filing of the Application in this matter trigger a hearing for a previous, dormant file that the applicant filed with the HRT0?
- Was the adjudicator protecting the respondents in this matter?
- Did the adjudicator publicly defame the applicant in the Final Decision?

DENISE GHANAM - ADJUDICATOR - EXPERIENCE AND ASSOCIATIONS:

WINDSOR UNIVERSITY - ST. CLARE COLLEGE BOARD OF GOVERNORS; ODETTE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS; UWE BRISTOL SCHOOL OF BUSINESS (ENGLAND), NAVY RESERVIST; FORMER PC CANDIDATE; EXPERIENCE IN THE BANKING AND AUTOMOTIVE SECTORS; STRATEGIC PLANNER; HR EXPERT. OWNS AN INDEPENDENT CONSULTING FIRM. STRONG BACKGROUND IN EQUITY AND DIVERSITY ISSUES. FOUNDING CHAIRPERSON OF THE WINDSOR EQUITY NETWORK. **PAST APPOINTMENT ON THE WINDSOR POLICE SERVICES BOARD (WPSB)** AND THE ONTARIO ASSOCIATION OF POLICE SERVICE BOARDS; **VOTING MEMBER OF WINDSOR-ESSEX LOCAL IMMIGRATION PARTNERSHIP (WE LIP)**, SEEMINGLY, AS PRESIDENT-ELECT OF THE WINDSOR HUMAN RESOURCES PROFESSIONALS ASSOCIATION; WINDSOR PORT

AUTHORITY BOARD; JUSTICE OF THE PEACE APPOINTMENTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE...

GHANAM WAS RE-APPOINTED AS FULL-TIME MEMBER OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS TRIBUNAL OF ONTARIO ON OCTOBER 21, 2023 BY ORDER-IN-COUNCIL FOR A FIXED TERM OF THREE YEARS, PURSUANT TO SUBSECTION 32(2) OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS CODE.

QUOTE BY DENISE GHANAM: "I have a lot of those connections to various diverse communities and to organizations that are working with those diverse communities."

CONFLICT OF INTEREST:

1. WINDSOR ESSEX CHILD/YOUTH ADVOCACY CENTRE PARTNERS:
 - ONTARIO PROVINCIAL POLICE
 - **WINDSOR POLICE SERVICES**
 - LASALLE POLICE SERVICES
 - **WINDSOR ESSEX CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETY**
 - WINDSOR REGIONAL HOSPITAL
 - SEXUAL ASSAULT CRISIS CENTRE
2. WE-LIP COMMUNITY FORUM 2022 (U OF W) - KEYNOTE SPEAKER:
JEAN SAMUEL - **FORMER DIRECTOR OF EQUITY & DIVERSITY & INCLUSION, THE ONTARIO ASSOCIATION OF CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETIES.**
3. WE-LIP VOTING ELIGIBLE COUNCIL MEMBER: LEONARDO GIL (U OF W) - **SENIOR DIRECTOR OF SERVICES, WINDSOR-ESSEX CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETY.**
4. WE-LIP VOTING ELIGIBLE COUNCIL MEMBER: **CHARLOTTE LEFRANK -EQUITY SPECIALIST, WINDSOR-ESSEX CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETY.**
5. WE-LIP VOTING ELIGIBLE COUNCIL MEMBER: TINA GATT - **COMMUNITY OUTREACH MANAGER, WINDSOR-ESSEX CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETY.**
6. WE-LIP VOTING ELIGIBLE COUNCIL MEMBER: **WINDSOR POLICE SERVICE**
7. WE-LIP VOTING ELIGIBLE COUNCIL MEMBER: **ST. CLAIR COLLEGE**
8. WE-LIP VOTING ELIGIBLE COUNCIL MEMBER: **UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR**
9. WORKFORCE WINDSOR-ESSEX - A CONNECTION TO WE LIP:
TERESA PIRUZZA, **FORMER MCYS MINISTER**

HISTORY OF FILE # 2022-49223-I:

A child with documented disabilities and very few personal belongings or effects was abandoned into my care in November, 2021. Over the course of three months it became apparent that the child had suffered adverse, harmful treatment by his previous caregiver(s) and that, in his best interest, mental, oral and physical health assessments were required. It became increasingly obvious, based on statements made by the child and the subsequent behaviour of the caregiver(s) that the child would not be able to safely return to the care of his previous caregiver(s) at that time.

As such, I, the applicant in this matter, requested service from the Highland Shores Children's Aid Society (HSCAS) on February 15, 2021.

Michael Evans, a so-called child protection worker, employed by HSCAS, verified, on March 18, 2021, that the child in my care was a child in need of protection, as defined by the Child, Youth and Family Services Act, 2017. Further, Michael Evans was satisfied that the child was at a place of safety while in my home/care but that, in the best interest of the child, ongoing HSCAS service would be required.

Oddly enough, however, Michael Evans consistently failed to provide service, denying the child a plan of care, access to education, imperative health and mental health services. At the same time, Michael Evans knew, or ought to have known, that I was receiving ODSP and that, in the absence of any sort of emergency funding, my ability to provide for the child was extremely limited.

It was my opinion that Michael Evans was actively discriminating against me, subsequently failing to act in the best interest of the child in my care.

AS SUCH, ON APRIL 26, 2021, I NOTIFIED THE HSCAS THAT:

*"Michael Evans, a HSCAS child protection worker, recently confirmed, or ought to have confirmed, that *redacted* alleges physical and emotional abuse, alienation, abandonment and neglect by *redacted*. Although *redacted* is currently safe, his special needs and long-term stability have been neglected by HSCAS in our opinion. *redacted* and his caregivers have been negatively affected as a result.*

*Prima facie discrimination, based on family status, and subsequently by possible association, has been established in these matters with HSCAS. Critical services are being withheld, based on family status, whereby a significant burden has been placed on *redacted*, *redacted* and myself, Brenda Everall.*

Differential treatment, based on an enumerated ground, has generated discrimination in a Substantive Sense.

**redacted* and Brenda Everall are requesting accommodation from HSCAS based on *redacted* disability, *redacted* disability and *redacted* current family status with *redacted* and Brenda Everall. The accommodations requested at this time include:*

- *Fair and impartial service provided by a qualified, authorized and accountable child welfare worker.*
- *Formal recognition of *redacted* kinship relationship with Brenda Everall.*
- *Service provided according to the rule of international, federal and provincial law and CAS policy.*

- *Prompt assistance with accessing appropriate support services for *redacted*.*
- *Prompt disclosure, to the appropriate parties, of the verification decision(s), determination(s), disposition(s) resulting from the recent child protection investigation, conducted by HSCAS, according to prescribed policy and law.*
- *Support, where appropriate, for Brenda Everall, acting for the benefit of *redacted*, in making application for a permanent custody order of him as per his personal will and best interest.*
- *Accurate written updates, at least once per month, until these matters have formally concluded.*
- *Prompt demonstration of an understanding that every human being has the right to experience fair and equal treatment from service providers while being free of any form of discrimination.*
- *Informing appropriate HSCAS administrators, board members and legal department, as necessary, that there has been an alleged breach of federal and provincial legislation and deviation from mandated CAS policy and procedure, from my perspective, and that remedy is subsequently sought.*
- *An immediate response to this Notice.*

*It was determined by HSCAS that it was safe and appropriate to leave *redacted* in the care of *redacted* and/or Brenda Everall. Removing *redacted* from our care before we've found appropriate resolution that works best for him, after prima facie discrimination has been established, would be a form of reprisal, contrary to the Ontario human rights code. This would be especially evident and true in the absence of any established concerns about the respective caregiving capacity of *redacted* and/or Brenda Everall and subsequently in the absence of any appropriate resolve with his mother or other extended family members.*

I've been adversely affected by CAS for two decades. I was targeted and harassed for service by various workers at the former Prince Edward County CAS, especially while attempting to expose the PECAS Foster Care Sexual Abuse Scandal. I am quite concerned at this point that there may be a direct correlation to my history with the former PECAS and this current discrimination that I'm experiencing from HSCAS. I remind and caution HSCAS staff that targeting me in any way, for any reason, is unlawful and intolerable.

I have been, and continue to be, patient, respectful and cooperative. I look forward to a resolution in this matter as soon as possible. Thank you.

*Sincerely
Brenda Everall"*

IN RETURN, ON OR ABOUT MAY 12, 2021, I RECEIVED AN EMAIL FROM MICHAEL EVANS WITH AN ATTACHMENT STATING:

"Dear Ms. Everall,

I have received and reviewed your correspondence to me dated: April 26, 2020. I am sending you this letter to advise that we have now closed our file.

Information regarding this investigation is now part of a provincial database which may be accessed by any Children's Aid Society in Ontario should they be involved with your family in the future.

I would like to thank you for your co-operation and extend best wishes for the future. Please do not hesitate to contact us if we can be of any further assistance at 613-962-9291.

Sincerely,

*Michael Evans
Child Protection Worker
Family Services Department*

*Lisa Mascherin
Child Protection Supervisor
Family Services Department"*

PRIMA FACIE DISCRIMINATION AGAINST ME, BY MICHAEL EVANS AND LISA MASCHERIN, BOTH HSCAS EMPLOYEES, WAS EFFECTIVELY ESTABLISHED ON MAY 12, 2021.

I FILED AN APPLICATION FOR DISCRIMINATION BASED ON DISABILITY AND FAMILY STATUS WITH THE HUMAN RIGHTS TRIBUNAL OF ONTARIO (HRTO) ON APRIL 26, 2022. (MAY 12, 2021 - APRIL 26, 2022 = 330 DAYS.) APPLICATION WAS ON TIME.

ON APRIL 26, 2022, THE HRTO RESPONDED TO MY APPLICATION SUBMISSION, STATING:

"Dear Brenda Everall,

Subject: Confirmation of Receipt of Application

The Human Rights Tribunal of Ontario (HRTO) is in receipt of your Application made under section 34 of the Human Rights Code.

Your application has been assigned file number 2022-49223-1 and your date of filing is April 26, 2022. You must include this file number in the subject line of all emails and on all correspondence and any documents filed with the HRTO.

Once you have filed your application and you receive your HRTO file number, do not submit any additional documents to the HRTO, including evidence and witness statements, until the HRTO directs you to do so.

Next Steps:

1. Completeness Check

The HRTO will review your Application to ensure it is complete. If the Application is not sufficiently complete it will be returned to you with directions about what information you must include to complete the Application. If you do not respond to a Notice of Incomplete Application, the HRTO may consider that you have abandoned your Application and close your file for that reason.

2. Jurisdiction

If there is a question about whether your Application is within the HRTO's authority or jurisdiction to decide, you will be sent a Notice of Intent to Dismiss. This Notice is only sent to you, the applicant. If you receive this Notice you must respond to the issue(s) identified in it. If you do not respond by the deadline listed in the Notice, the HRTO may make a decision on the issue(s) using only the material already in the file, or even consider that you have abandoned your Application and close it for that reason.

3. Deferral

If there is a question about whether your Application should be deferred (put on hold) until another proceeding is completed, the HRTO will send you a Notice of Intent to Defer. This Notice is sent to all parties listed the Application along with a copy of your Application. The term "parties" refers to the applicant, respondent(s), and any affected parties listed in the Application (Form 1) or Response (Form 2). All of the parties, including you, will be given an opportunity to submit a response to the Notice. If a party does not respond by the deadline listed in the Notice, the HRTO will make a decision on the issue using only the material already in the file and any submissions filed by the other parties.

4. Delivery of Application

If there are no preliminary issues and if your Application is complete, the HRTO will send it to the respondent(s) and to any trade union, occupational or professional organization or person identified as an affected person in the Application. The Application will be delivered to the parties using the contact information you provided in your Form 1. The respondent(s) will have 35 days to file a Response (Form 2)."

ON OR ABOUT JUNE 3, 2022, I RECEIVED THE FOLLOWING NOTICE FROM THE HRTO:

"Dear parties,

The hearing in this matter is scheduled for August 9, 2022 via Zoom. Please see the attached Notice of Summary Preliminary Hearing. Please be sure to read the Notice in it's entirety as it contains important information about our process.

Please find below the meeting link to connect to the videoconference via Zoom.

Representatives must forward this email, including the link and login information below, to their clients and any other necessary participant so they may join the hearing via Zoom.

To join the videoconference, select the Join Zoom Meeting link below. You will be prompted to join the meeting either via the Zoom app or on the web. Information and resources regarding Zoom events, consult the Tribunals Ontario Guide to Videoconference Proceedings and Zoom.

The parties are recommended to arrive at least 10 minutes prior to the scheduled hearing time to ensure videoconference equipment is working, the room is setup appropriately, and there are no connectivity issues. Please allow Zoom to connect to your audio and video when prompted.

Human Rights Tribunal of Ontario is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.

Topic: 2018-32832-I Brenda Everall v. Ryan Coens and Rebecca Coens

Time: Aug 9, 2022 09:30 AM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/89456764264>

Meeting ID: 894 5676 4264

Passcode: 286088

One tap mobile

+12042727920,,89456764264# Canada

+14388097799,,89456764264# Canada

Dial by your location

+1 204 272 7920 Canada

+1 438 809 7799 Canada

+1 587 328 1099 Canada

+1 647 374 4685 Canada

+1 647 558 0588 Canada

+1 778 907 2071 Canada

+1 780 666 0144 Canada

855 703 8985 Canada Toll-free

Meeting ID: 894 5676 4264

Find your local number: <https://us06web.zoom.us/u/kutGAQviu>

Join by SIP

89456764264@zoomcrc.com

Join by H.323

162.255.37.11 (US West)

162.255.36.11 (US East)

115.114.131.7 (India Mumbai)
115.114.115.7 (India Hyderabad)
213.19.144.110 (Amsterdam Netherlands)
213.244.140.110 (Germany)
103.122.166.55 (Australia Sydney)
103.122.167.55 (Australia Melbourne)
149.137.40.110 (Singapore)
64.211.144.160 (Brazil)
149.137.68.253 (Mexico)
69.174.57.160 (Canada Toronto)
65.39.152.160 (Canada Vancouver)
207.226.132.110 (Japan Tokyo)
149.137.24.110 (Japan Osaka)
Meeting ID: 894 5676 4264
Passcode: 286088

Sincerely/Cordialement,
Office of the Registrar | Bureau du Greffier
Human Rights Tribunal of Ontario | Tribunal des droits de la personne de l'Ontario
Tel/Tél.: 416-326-1312 | Toll-free/Sans frais: 1-866-598-0322 | TTY/ ATS:
1-800-855-0511
hrt.registrar@ontario.ca | tribunalsontario.ca

ON JULY 26, 2022, I SENT THE FOLLOWING CORRESPONDENCE TO THE HRTO:

"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 re-activated 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.

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”

**I RECEIVED A NOTICE OF INTENT TO DISMISS FROM THE HRTO ON OR ABOUT
AUGUST 3, 2022, STATING:**

Brenda Everall

via email: brendaeoverall@gmail.com

*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”.*

• 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.

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”*

ON OR ABOUT AUGUST 9, 2022, I SUBMITTED THE FOLLOWING CORRESPONDENCE TO THE HRTO:

“HUMAN RIGHTS TRIBUNAL OF ONTARIO - COMPLAINT

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

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

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 andr 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 #2018-32832I 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 #2018-32832I. 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 #2018-32832I, 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 #2018-32832I 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”.

- *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.

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.

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.

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 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*

SUBSEQUENTLY, ON AUGUST 9, 2022, BOTH THE COUNSEL FOR THE RESPONDENT IN THE MATTER OF FILE #2018-32832-I AND MYSELF ATTENDED THE SCHEDULED HRTO SUMMARY HEARING VIA VIDEOCONFERENCE. THE ADJUDICATOR STATED THAT A DECISION COULD BE EXPECTED WITHIN A MAXIMUM OF SIX MONTHS. TO DATE NO DECISION HAS BEEN RENDERED BY THE HRTO IN THE OUTSTANDING MATTER OF FILE #2018-32832-I.

I RECEIVED THE FOLLOWING REPLY FROM THE HRTO ON OR ABOUT AUGUST 10, 2022:

"Dear Brenda Everall,

Thank you for your recent correspondence regarding the applications presently before the Human Rights Tribunal of Ontario.

Upon review, we note that you have two separate applications before that Tribunal

which are as follows:

2018-32832-I Brenda Everall v. Ryan Coens and Rebecca Coens

2022-49223-I Brenda Everall v. Highland Shores Children's Aid Society, Michael Evans and Lisa Mascherin

All files before the Tribunal are judged on their own merits. It should also be noted that information on a given file is only shared with the parties identified in the application of said file.

The matters you raise in your correspondence regarding file 2018-32832 relate to an application that has always been open and is currently under review by an adjudicator. As such, it is inappropriate for the us to comment further.

The Tribunal will send you information regarding the next steps in each file as soon as this information becomes available.

*Sincerely,
Office of the HRTO Registrar"*

ON SEPTEMBER 2, 2022, I RESPONDED TO THE NOID:

SEPTEMBER 2, 2022

HRTO File #2022-49223-I

Brenda Everall 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 HRTO. 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 physical 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 HRTTO 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/1Bqi152Vnyzvrntej5v5XMYoMammEx6rkhDe9HcaDlI8/edit?usp=sharing>

*Sincerely
Brenda Everall"*

ON OR ABOUT OCTOBER 24, 2023, A DECISION WAS RENDERED BY HRTO ADJUDICATOR, DENISE GHANAM.

FINAL DECISION ANALYSIS AND DISPOSITION:

[1] The applicant filed an Application alleging discrimination based on family status and disability in goods and services, contrary to the Human Rights Code, R.S.O. 1990, c. H. 19, as amended (the "Code"). Specifically, the applicant alleged that the respondents discriminated against them by not approving their application for benefits.

DISAGREE: The applicant requested services from the HSCAS. The applicant, at no point, sought or requested specific 'benefits' from the HSCAS. Suggesting that the applicant was only seeking 'benefits' minimizes the fact that the HSCAS unlawfully failed to provide a disadvantaged child in need of protection with any services to him or his unorthodox family unit, whatsoever! Subsequently, the applicant verily believes that the adjudicator is employing a form

of psychological warfare against the applicant where an attempt is made to make the applicant feel small, needy and desperate. The applicant never filed an 'application for benefits' with the HSCAS. To state otherwise is **an outright, intentional act of libel defamation** that must be urgently, transparently reconciled! The defaming material is currently posted to Canlii for all the world to see. The applicant does not intend to stand down from this matter and subsequently urges the HRTTO to immediately respond to and subsequently rectify, in any way possible and to the point of undue hardship, the harm that's being caused to the applicant and to the applicant's reputation through the adjudicator's public attack against the applicant!

[2] The Tribunal sent the applicant a Notice of Intent to Dismiss the Application (the "Notice") dated August 3, 2022, advising that the Application appeared to be outside of the Tribunal's jurisdiction because the narrative setting out the incidents of alleged discrimination failed to identify any specific acts of discrimination within the meaning of the Code allegedly committed by the respondents. Further, it appears that the events described in the Application are untimely, falling outside the Tribunal's one year limit.

DISAGREE: The last occurrence of discrimination occurred on MAY 12, 2021. The application was filed on APRIL 26, 2022 The application was filed within 330 days of the last occurrence of discrimination. APPLICATION WAS ON TIME!

Any questions about timeliness and jurisdiction were answered when the applicant responded to the NOID. If questions remained thereafter, the applicant was more than willing to put those questions to rest at a preliminary hearing. A preliminary hearing was allegedly held in the absence of the applicant. The applicant was not notified about the hearing, only learning about such in the final decision of October 24, 2023.

Can the HRTTO possibly explain how or why "it appears that the events described in the Application are untimely, falling outside of the Tribunal's one year limit", because there is absolutely no question, whatsoever, of timeliness in this matter!

[3] The applicant filed submissions in response to the Notice which I have carefully considered.

DISAGREE: If the adjudicator 'carefully considered' the applicant's filed submissions then it would have become immediately evident to the adjudicator that there was never a genuine question of timeliness.

[4] This decision was made following a hearing in writing. As noted by the Divisional Court in *Iyirhiaro v. Human Rights Tribunal of Ontario and TTC*, 2012 ONSC 3015, the Tribunal is not required to hold an oral hearing on the issue of its jurisdiction.

DISAGREE: applicant was never notified of an alleged written hearing. No date of Hearing is disclosed by the Adjudicator. applicant was denied disclosure and/or opportunity to participate in so-called written hearing. Although "the Tribunal is not required to hold an oral hearing on the

issue of its jurisdiction”, the Tribunal should not be holding private, secret hearings in the absence of the applicant’s knowledge or participation. Citing case law to reinforce this sneaky manoeuvre clearly indicates the adjudicator’s intent to act in bad faith against the applicant.

[5] To proceed in the Tribunal’s process, an Application must fall within the Tribunal’s jurisdiction. An adjudicative body either has jurisdiction or it does not. See *G.-L. v. OHIP (General Manager)*, 2014 ONSC 5392.

AGREE: Yes! An adjudicative body either has jurisdiction or it does not! Obviously, the HRTO decided that it had jurisdiction or the matter would’ve been properly disposed of long ago. The question of jurisdiction was answered but, for whatever reason, the adjudicator remains arbitrarily focused on the moot points of timeliness and jurisdiction especially when the applicant was prepared to answer outstanding questions of jurisdiction and/or timeliness but was denied the opportunity to do so through a preliminary hearing that was held, again, in the absence of the applicant’s knowledge.

[6] The Tribunal’s jurisdiction is limited to enforcement of the Code. The Code only prohibits actions that discriminate against people based on their enumerated ground(s) in a protected social area. This means that the Tribunal does not have jurisdiction over general allegations of unfairness unrelated to the Code. See *Hay v. Ontario (Human Rights Tribunal)*, 2014 ONSC 2858 (“Hay”) and *Bello v. Toronto Transit Commission*, 2014 ONSC 5535 and *Groblicki v. Watts Water*, 2021 HRTO 461 (“Groblicki”).

AGREE/DISAGREE: Sure, the points made by the adjudicator are accurate. The applicant, however, has already spoken to the question of general unfairness as opposed to unlawful discrimination. The applicant made it very clear that she understands the difference between unfairness and unlawful discrimination and that she would prove that she had been discriminated against if given the opportunity to present evidence that the HRTO has never given her the chance to present. The applicant has been barred from receiving requested accommodation and procedural fairness since this particular application was filed with the HRTO!

[7] By virtue of their humanity, everyone will identify with at least one Code-enumerated ground and, over the course of their lifetime, most people will suffer some form of adverse treatment which may or may not be connected to the Code. Because of this, the Code does not assume that all adverse treatment is discriminatory.

AGREE/DISAGREE: Again, the points are accurate but the adjudicator keeps beating the same dead horse, so to speak. The applicant verily believes that the adjudicator is grasping at straws in an attempt to dispose of this Application in any way possible, even if that means breaching the applicant’s rights, harassing the applicant, causing the applicant unnecessary emotional distress while abusing her powers and blatantly violating the HRTO’s rules of procedure.

[8] To fall within the Tribunal’s jurisdiction, an applicant must provide some factual

basis beyond a bald assertion which links their ground(s) to the respondents' actions and explains why they think that these actions are discriminatory in nature. See Hay and Bello, above and also Mehedi v Mondalez Bakery, 2023 ONSC 1737 ("Mehedi") and Heath-Engel v. Seneca College, 2023 ONSC 5441. Both of those rulings of the Divisional Court upheld the Tribunal's right to dismiss an Application that makes no clear connection between alleged adverse treatment and the enumerated grounds cited, other than a bald assertion by the applicant.

AGREE: It certainly does require more than a bald assertion to establish that one's human rights have been violated. As per ohrc.on.ca, we come to understand that:

"The Code does not provide a definition of discrimination. Instead, the understanding of discrimination has evolved from case law. To establish prima facie discrimination (discrimination on its face) under the Code, a claimant must show that:

- *they have a characteristic protected from discrimination*
- *they have experienced an adverse impact within a social area protected by the Code, and*
- *the protected characteristic was a factor in the adverse impact.*

The claimant must show that discrimination occurred on a "balance of probabilities," that is, it is more reasonable and probable than not that discrimination took place. Once a prima facie case has been established, the burden shifts to the respondent to justify the conduct within the framework of the exemptions available under the Code (e.g. bona fide requirement defence). If it cannot be justified, discrimination will be found to have occurred."

Once the HRTO accepts an application and procedural motions begin, an applicant must, obviously, be provided an opportunity to go beyond bald assertions by presenting facts and subsequent evidence at a hearing. The applicant has never been afforded an opportunity to present evidence or to have her voice heard by the HRTO in this particular matter. The HRTO and/or the adjudicator have been blocking the applicant's right to procedural fairness since the application was filed!

Also, the applicant has never received a Response from the respondent. The proceedings in this matter have been extremely unusual and differential whereby harm and disadvantage is being caused to the applicant. The applicant fails to understand how the adjudicator in this particular matter can claim to be an equity and diversity professional while simultaneously generating intentional inequity and adversity for others as an HRTO adjudicator.

[9] In this Application, the applicant states that they requested the respondents to provide child welfare services to a child in their care. The applicant alleges that the respondents investigated the situation but decided not to provide any financial assistance or benefits. They allege they received this poor service because the respondents

discriminated against them on the basis of their disability and family status. However, they do not clearly explain why.

AGREE/DISAGREE: The applicant did, certainly, request service from HSCAS. Again, it wasn't that the HSCAS decided not to provide 'financial assistance or benefits' to a child in verified need of protection, it was that the HSCAS decided to provide no service whatsoever, even after specific human rights accommodations were requested by the applicant. The applicant did explain, clearly in fact, why the discrimination occurred from her perspective, but, again, after responding to the NOID, the applicant was denied any and all subsequent opportunities to fairly participate in HRTD proceedings! The adjudicator attempts to humiliate the applicant by stating that the applicant was denied sole financial benefits, when, again, it was services in general that the applicant was denied, thus leaving a child in need of protection and nurturing in an extremely precarious and unlawful situation! Again, had the applicant been given an opportunity to present evidence, the answer as to how and why the discrimination occurred would've been clearly answered! The applicant verily believes that this is the exact reason that she was alienated away from tribunal proceedings in the first place! It seems to the applicant that the adjudicator has attempted to cover up for bad actors in the child protection industry. The fact that the adjudicator is connected to so many key players in the child protection industry is utterly outrageous! From the applicant's perspective, a reasonable mind can't possibly minimize, ignore, justify or otherwise excuse this glaring conflict of interest!

[10] In response to the Notice, the applicant indicated again that they were denied services by the respondents stating that:

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 physical [sic] 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 cannot 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!

AGREE: The applicant did, indeed, indicate that a specific act of discrimination occurred on May 13, 2021. It's not clear, however, what the adjudicator is actually attempting to assert in referencing this particular selection of the applicant's submissions.

[11] The applicant asserted that the respondents discriminated against them because they have a disability and because their family status is outside the usual norm, but they provided no details of what their disability was, what actual accommodations they required beyond demanding supports from the CAS, or how the respondents treated them differently based on either their disability or their family status.

DISAGREE: The applicant was receiving services from HSCAS and specifically asked for accommodation based on disability and family status. Instead of acting on the accommodation - to the point of undue hardship - the HSCAS closed the file and denied services to a child in need of protection. That's discrimination on its face! It's absurd that the applicant has to explain how wrong this is to the HRTTO!

Specific accommodations were requested by the applicant. Did the adjudicator not read the Application in its entirety or is the adjudicator, perhaps, attempting to misconstrue the facts of the matter?

The nature of the applicant's disability was discussed between herself and Michael Evans at the home visit that occurred at the applicant's home on March 18, 2021. Michael Evans subsequently knew that the applicant was receiving ODSP for her disability while the child in her care was disabled in his own right. Again, the applicant intended to speak more to the effects of her disability and the impact that discrimination had on her disability, as necessary, but her voice was stifled by the adjudicator and she was never given the opportunity to speak to the facts of the matter. One can't possibly say all there is to say in an application. That's exactly what tribunal proceedings were designed for! It's a process that takes time and a person can't be expected to make their whole case in a brief application with no further chance to speak at a hearing of some sort.

Unfortunately, the adjudicator has, with persistent, conscious effort, attempted to rob the applicant of her voice, her dignity, the right of access to justice and, ultimately, the quality and enjoyment of life. The grotesque offensive elephant in the room can't be ignored! Does the HRTTO consider what's going on here to be transparent and accountable? Can the HRTTO point to any notion of procedural fairness or actual equity afforded to the applicant in this matter?

The applicant understood that the HSCAS was likely to discriminate against her because the applicant has been targeted for oppression by the PECAS and HSCAS since she began blowing the whistle on CAS crimes in the early 2000's. As such, the applicant made it very clear to the HSCAS that to deny service to a child in need of protection over a vendetta that HSCAS might have with the applicant would not only be inhumane and immoral but outright criminal. Still, HSCAS intentionally left a disadvantaged child and his nearly incapacitated makeshift family to hang, precariously, in the balance while unlawfully refusing to provide necessary services in any way, shape or form!

[12] The denial of service could be related to a long and difficult history that the applicant has with the respondent organization and with other publically funded government agencies ("Crown") organizations they believe are systematically denying their rights. They wrote a letter to this Tribunal recently regarding this file and another outstanding complaint:

I'm a targeted individual and I need to protect myself from bad faith actors within the Crown system of Canada. As such, I seriously intend to file

complaints with the United Nations at this point and I have no problem, whatsoever, adding the HRTO and its administrators to my list of alleged colonial oppressors if that's what all of this is actually going to come to!

AGREE: The adjudicator admits that the denial of service might be based on the “difficult history’ that the applicant has had with the respondent and other publicly funded government agencies (“Crown”) organizations they believe are systemically denying their rights.” It’s taken the applicant quite some time to research and to understand the nature of Canada’s actual government because that truth simply isn’t taught in the schools of the so-called peasantry nor portrayed, with any degree of accuracy, in the official historicity of Canada. At any rate, and for the record, the applicant now asserts that the Crown and the powers behind the Throne are responsible for some of the systematic oppression that she’s experienced in the past, but that the governor general, lieutenant governors and other colonial actors in Canada are a hidden source of much of the applicant’s troubles with oppression. Still, the applicant has all intentions of reporting ongoing colonial crimes in Canada, regardless of who’s behind them, to the United Nations and other international bodies. The adjudicator can attempt to ridicule that fact all day long but it remains a fact. The adjudicator seems to be gaslighting the applicant with the statements and references made in Paragraph [12].

[13] With respect to the “Crown system” they wrote the following in their Application:

The Crown regime has taken over world governments while performing a global reset via the alleged Covid-19 pandemic. The life, liberty and security of the people of Canada is under direct threat by the Crown regime that is currently operating in Canada and most other countries throughout the world.

The applicant admits that she was wrong in her assertion about the Crown regime taking over world governments. As mentioned previously, the applicant had to research the actual nature of the Canadian government to understand how it’s actually structured. The applicant has come to understand much more about the nature of Canada’s dual government system than she did when first filing her Application. This is not the fault of the applicant as, again, the actual nature of the Canadian government is concealed, for the most part, from average Canadians.

It appears that it’s the Commonwealth of Nations behind much of the corruption in Canada. It further appears that it’s the Commonwealth that’s taking hold of world governments and facilitating a global reset. Again, any discrepancies would’ve been cleared up by the applicant had the applicant’s voice not been choked off in the preliminary stages of the proceedings by the adjudicator. Why the adjudicator insists on referring to secondary facts over the primary allegations made in the application is perplexing and subsequently suggestive of another instance of psychological warfare purported against the applicant by the adjudicator.

[14] With respect to the respondent organization in this Application, they wrote the Following:

The Children's Aid Society operating in Ontario, Canada is a terrorist agency. I have been exposing this fact since the early 2000's. As a result of my advocacy against the CAS, my family and I have been targeted by CAS for outright harassment and discrimination for over two decades... I believe that the harassment and discrimination is an extension of historical oppression levied against me and my attempts to expose a human trafficking and sexual abuse network that the CAS is operating and colluding with other professional organizations to cover up.

AGREE: Truer words were never spoken! That the adjudicator will acknowledge but then minimize alleged harassment, discrimination and long-term oppression is morally and professionally reprehensible! Again, making reference to the applicant's statements regarding systematic oppression is, from the applicant's perspective, meant to be damaging to the psyche and emotions of the applicant. Behaviour of this sort, displayed by a so-called equity and human rights professional explains, from the applicant's perspective, exactly why Canada is in peril that we all know that it's in!

[15] While there is a possible temporal link between the applicant's alleged request for accommodation on the basis of their disability and family status and the respondents' closure of the file, that alone is not sufficient to determine that the denial of service was due to their enumerated grounds. Many other factors are considered when determining what supports are provided to a child in need of care. Again, the applicant failed to provide any alleged factual basis, or even anything from which I could draw an inference, to link their assertions about enumerated grounds to the alleged adverse treatment.

DISAGREE: More than a possible link between the request for accommodation existed. It's a bona fide prima facie case for goodness sake!

The applicant's request for accommodation was not alleged. The evidence of the accommodation request was included in the Application!

Closing a file for mandated services after receiving a request for accommodation based on disability and family status is outright, undeniable discrimination.

The adjudicator attempts to excuse HSCAS bad faith actors in stating that:

"Many other factors are considered when determining what supports are provided to a child in need of care."

The adjudicator acknowledges that the HSCAS closed the file on a child in need of care. The adjudicator needs to accept that closing the file of a child in need of care is unlawful and that doing so after a legitimate, reasonable request for accommodations based on enumerated grounds is subsequently unlawful, prima facie discrimination!

The applicant provided as much of an alleged factual basis as she possibly could before being barred from participating in HRTO proceedings by the adjudicator. That the adjudicator was unable to draw an inference to link the applicant's assertions about enumerated grounds to the alleged adverse treatment is due to the adjudicator's own shortcomings and is certainly not owing to any failure on the part of the applicant as any reasonable person can plainly see that, to say the very least, the adjudicator has not operated with procedural fairness or sound professional integrity in this matter!

[16] As noted above, and confirmed by Mehedi, it is not enough for an applicant to assert that they have an enumerated ground(s) and have received adverse treatment at the hands of the respondents. To come within the Tribunal's jurisdiction, the applicant must provide some factual basis to link the respondents' conduct to their Code-enumerated ground(s). A bald assertion that the adverse treatment they received was owing to their enumerated ground(s) is not enough to provide the required factual basis.

AGREE/DISAGREE: Again, the adjudicator denied the applicant the opportunity to go beyond making so-called bald assertions by denying the applicant the right to participate in HRTO proceedings and arbitrarily barring the applicant's right to access justice in Canada.

[17] In the circumstances of this case, I find that the applicant has failed to provide a factual basis beyond a bald assertion which links their ground(s) to the respondents's actions. Accordingly, the Application does not fall within the Tribunal's jurisdiction.

DISAGREE: The matter is absolutely in the jurisdiction of the tribunal. The applicant did not fail to provide a factual basis beyond a bald assertion but rather the adjudicator failed to follow the mandate, rules and procedures of the HRTO, causing undue harm and disadvantage to the applicant!

[18] For the above reasons, the Application is dismissed.

DISAGREE: The application was unfairly disposed of by the adjudicator. The adjudicator did not follow procedure, thus denying the applicant any equitable remedy for serious human rights violations.

CASE LAW - FAMILY STATUS - DISABILITY - ACCOMMODATION - DISCRIMINATION

Devaney v. ZRV Holdings Limited, 2012 HRTO 1590

Seeley v. Canadian National Railway, 2010 CHRT 23

Misetich v. Value Village Stores Inc., 2016 HRTO 1229

Adga Group Consultants Inc. v. Lane, 2008

Canada (Attorney General) v. Johnstone, 2014 FCA 110

SMS Equipment Inc v Communications, Energy and Paperworkers Union, Local 707, 2015 ABQB 162

Canada (Attorney General) v. Johnstone, 2014 FCA 110

Partridge v. Botony Dental Corporation, 2015 ONCA 836
Canada (Attorney General) v. Hicks, 2015 FC 599

POTENTIAL TORTS COMMITTED BY ADJUDICATOR:

- INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS
- BAD FAITH
- MALFEASANCE
- NEGLIGENCE/BREACH OF DUTY
- LIBEL/DEFAMATION
- HARASSMENT, ETC...

Serious legal action is pending against the HRTO and the adjudicator, respectively, in this matter!

I look forward to hearing back from the HRTO in a timely manner in regard to this Request for Reconsideration.

Sincerely,
Brenda Everall
205-414 Dundas St. W
Belleville, ON K8P 1B4
brendaeverall@gmail.com