

Court File No. *CU-11-5179*

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE

BETWEEN:



Derek Dunlop

Plaintiff

-and-

*Michael C. Birnie, Vanessa Glasser, Sara Blake, Gillian Dingle, Patricia Jackson,
Ron Lavigne, Scott McIntyre, Alain Hacquard, Michelle Ryan, Ian Shago,
Justice of the Peace, Michel Moreau, Justice of the Peace, Michael Kitlar,
Andrew Hainsworth and Dr. Jeff Phillips*

Defendants

STATEMENT OF CLAIM

TO THE DEFENDANTS

A LEGAL PROCEEDING HAS BEEN COMMENCED AGAINST YOU by the plaintiff. The claim made against you is set out in the following pages.

IF YOU WISH TO DEFEND THIS PROCEEDING, you or an Ontario lawyer acting for you must prepare a statement of defence in Form 18A prescribed by the Rules of Civil Procedure, serve it on the plaintiff's lawyer or, where the plaintiff does not have a lawyer, serve it on the plaintiff, and file it, with proof of service in this court office, WITHIN TWENTY DAYS after this statement of claim is served on you, if you are served in Ontario.

If you are served in another province or territory of Canada or in the United States of America, the period for serving and filing your statement of defence is forty days. If you are served outside Canada and the United States of America, the period is sixty days.

Instead of serving and filing a statement of defence, you may serve and file a notice of intent to defend in Form 18B prescribed by the Rules of Civil Procedure. This will entitle you to ten more days within which to serve and file your statement of defence.

IF YOU FAIL TO DEFEND THIS PROCEEDING, JUDGMENT MAY BE GIVEN AGAINST YOU IN YOUR ABSENCE AND WITHOUT FURTHER NOTICE TO YOU. IF YOU WISH TO DEFEND THIS PROCEEDING BUT ARE UNABLE TO PAY LEGAL FEES, LEGAL AID MAY BE AVAILABLE TO YOU BY CONTACTING A LOCAL LEGAL AID OFFICE.

IF YOU PAY THE PLAINTIFF'S CLAIM, and \$2 000.00 for costs, within the time for serving and filing your statement of defence you may move to have this proceeding dismissed by the court. If you believe the amount claimed for costs is excessive, you may pay the plaintiff's claim and \$400 for costs and have the costs assessed by the court.

Date *May 19 2011* Issued by *[Signature]*
Local registrar

Address of
court office

Civil and Family Division
North Bay Courthouse
360 Plouffe Street
North Bay, Ontario
P1B 9L5

TO Michael C. Birnie, 116 McIntyre Street West, P. O. Box 100, North Bay, Ontario
P1B 8G8

AND Vanessa Glasser, 720 Bay Street, 8th Floor, Toronto, Ontario, M5G 2K1

AND Sara Blake, 720 Bay Street, 8th Floor, Toronto, Ontario, M5G 2K1

AND Gillian Dingle, 79 Wellington Street West, Suite 3000, Box 270, TD Centre,
Toronto, Ontario, M5K 1N2

AND Patricia Jackson, 79 Wellington Street West, Suite 3000, Box 270, TD Centre,
Toronto, Ontario, M5K 1N2

AND Alain Hacquard, 360 Plouffe Street, North Bay, Ontario, P1B 9L5

AND Michelle Ryan, 360 Plouffe Street, North Bay, Ontario, P1B 9L5

AND Justice of the Peace, Michel Moreau, 360 Plouffe Street, North Bay, ON, P1B 9L5

AND Justice of the Peace, Michael Kitlar, 360 Plouffe Street, North Bay, ON, P1B 9L5

AND Ron Lavigne, 201-245 Oak Street East, North Bay, Ontario, P1B 8P8

AND Scott McIntyre, 201-245 Oak Street East, North Bay, Ontario, P1B 8P8

AND Ian Shago, P. O. Box 1411, North Bay, Ontario, P1B 8K6

AND Andrew Hainsworth, 1560 Brimley Road, Suite 127, Toronto, Ontario, M1P 3G9

AND Dr. Jeff Phillips, 37 Sherbrooke Street, North Bay, Ontario, P1B 2C2.

CLAIM

1. The plaintiff claims against the Defendants, Michael C. Birnie, Vanessa Glasser, Sara Blake, Gillian Dingle, Patricia Jackson, Ian Shago, Andrew Hainsworth, Ron Lavigne, Scott McIntyre, Alain Hacquard, Michelle Ryan, Justice of the Peace, Michel Moreau and Justice of the Peace Michael Kitlar or anyone else of any of their affiliates who become implicated and/or are implicated by this process for:
 - (a) general and special damages in the amount of \$ 5 000, 000.00
 - (b) punitive, aggravated and exemplary damages in the amount of \$ 5 000, 000.00
 - (c) compensatory damages for the breach of duty in the amount of \$1 000, 000.00
 - (d) prejudgment and postjudgment interest on the above pursuant to the Courts of Justice Act, R. S. O. 1990. Ch. C-43, ss. 127-130
 - (e) the Plaintiff's costs of this action on a substantial indemnity basis, or on such further and other basis as this Honourable Court allows.
 - (f) reimbursement of any previous legal fees that the Plaintiff has incurred in relation to this matter.
 - (g) reimbursement of any travel expenses to and from court that the Plaintiff will incur.
 - (h) reimbursement of any previous research fees and future research fees that the Plaintiff will incur.
 - (i) an order for the appointment of an inspector and/or investigation order into the entire affairs and management of The North Bay Courthouse.
 - (j) a declaration that Plaintiff's rights under sections 7, 9, 10, 11(b), 11(d), 11(e), 12, 15(1) and 24(1) of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms have been infringed upon by some, all or some combination of all of the Defendants.
 - (k) such further and other relief as this Honourable Court deems just.

The Parties

2. The Plaintiff, Derek Dunlop is an individual resident in the District of Nipissing in the City of North Bay, Ontario.
3. The Defendant, Michael C. Birnie is an attorney working for the Birnie Law Firm and is a resident of the District of Nipissing in the City of North Bay, Ontario.
4. The Defendant, Vanessa Glasser is a civil law attorney employed by the Ministry of the Attorney General in the City of Toronto, Ontario.
5. The Defendant, Sara Blake is a civil law attorney employed by the Ministry of the Attorney General in the City of Toronto, Ontario.
6. The Defendant, Gillian Dingle is a civil law attorney employed by the law firm Torys, LLP in the City of Toronto, Ontario.

7. The Defendant, Patricia Jackson is a civil law attorney employed by the law firm Torys, LLP in the City of Toronto, Ontario.
8. The Defendant, Ian Shago is a Process Server and Bailiff with the North Bay Bailiffs and Process Servers and is an individual resident in the District of Nipissing in the City of North Bay, Ontario.
9. The Defendant, Andrew Hainsworth is a Process Server and Manager with the Dominion Process Servers in the City of Toronto, Ontario.
10. The Defendant, Scott McIntyre is employed as a Probation & Parole Officer employed with the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services in North Bay, Ontario. Scott McIntyre is an individual resident in the District of Nipissing in the City of North Bay, Ontario.
11. The Defendant, Ron Lavigne is employed as a Probation & Parole Officer employed with the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services in North Bay, Ontario. Ron Lavigne is an individual resident in the District of Nipissing in the City of North Bay, Ontario.
12. The Defendant, Michelle Ryan is employed as a member of the court staff at the North Bay Courthouse. Michelle Ryan is an individual resident in the District of Nipissing in the City of North Bay, Ontario.
13. The Defendant, Alain Hacquard is employed as a member of the court staff at the North Bay Courthouse. Alain Hacquard is an individual resident in the District of Nipissing in the City of North Bay, Ontario.
14. The Defendant, Michel Moreau is gainfully employed as a Justice of the Peace in the Northeast Region of Ontario. Michel Moreau is an individual resident of the North Bay and surrounding area.
15. The Defendant, Michael Kitlar is gainfully employed as a Justice of the Peace in the Northeast Region of Ontario. Michael Kitlar is an individual resident in the District of Nipissing in the City of North Bay, Ontario.

Michael C. Birnie

16. Michael Birnie is a lawyer that has worked as an attorney for the Birnie Law Firm in North Bay, Ontario for decades.
17. As a result of Michael Birnie being a lawyer in North Bay, Ontario for the number of years that he has Michael Birnie would have established personal, professional, social and recreational relationships with members of the North Bay Police Service. Furthermore, Michael Birnie would have developed friendships (personally and professionally) with members of the North Bay Police Service. More specifically, Michael Birnie would have established bonds and attachments with the North Bay Police Service and employees of their organization. In addition, these friendships, companionships and comradery with members of the North Bay Police Service would continue to grow on a daily basis. It would not be surprising if Michael Birnie is part or has been part of there Board of Governors, police committees and so on. If any of this is true this would produce a direct conflict of interest. It is a conflict of interest for Michael Birnie to represent and defend the clients that he does regardless of the above noted points.

18. Michael Birnie has intentionally implicated himself in the matter of Derek Dunlop vs. the North Bay Police Service et. al. and Michael Birnie has done so knowing full well that crimes, set-ups, illegal actions, misconduct, improprieties, wrongdoings and transgressions have been intentionally and purposely conducted against Derek Dunlop. As a result of intentionally involving himself, Michael Birnie has contributed to the on-going cover-ups, collusion, corruption, conspiracy and coercion that continues to grow against Derek Dunlop.
19. Michael Birnie possesses strong personal emotions and personal feelings towards the Defendants that he is representing. It is highly evident that Michael Birnie can not disassociate those positive emotions and feelings from the matter at hand. As a result of the relationships that Michael Birnie has established with members of the North Bay Police Service over the years it is currently preventing him from conducting himself in a professional, courtesy, respectful and decent manner in relation to the civil law suit initiated against his clients.
20. It is highly evident that Michael Birnie is unable to conduct himself in a manner that is free from and without prejudices towards Derek Dunlop, that is free from and without discriminations towards Derek Dunlop, that is free from and without biases towards Derek Dunlop.
21. Michael Birnie has further displayed his ignorance toward Derek Dunlop by exhibiting his lack of professionalism in many ways. Michael Birnie did not bother to contact Derek Dunlop to determine whether he would be available for a court date on May 20th, 2011. Michael Birnie just proceeded to schedule a court proceeding in the matter Derek Dunlop vs. the North Bay Police Service et al without contacting Derek Dunlop, without consulting with Derek Dunlop, without confirming with Derek Dunlop and without asking Derek Dunlop whether he was or was not available. It must be noted that if Michael Birnie was dealing with another person, lawyer, client, plaintiff and/or crown attorney that Michael Birnie would possess the professional courtesy to contact the person in the first place.
22. Michael Birnie has further displayed his ignorance toward Derek Dunlop by exhibiting his lack of professionalism in many ways. Michael Birnie did not bother to contact Derek Dunlop to determine whether he would be available for a court date on June 1st, 2011. Michael Birnie just proceeded to schedule a court proceeding in the matter Derek Dunlop vs. the North Bay Police Service et al without contacting Derek Dunlop, without consulting with Derek Dunlop, without confirming with Derek Dunlop and without asking Derek Dunlop whether he was or was not available. It must be noted that if Michael Birnie was dealing with another person, lawyer, client, plaintiff and/or crown attorney that Michael Birnie would possess the professional courtesy to contact the person in the first place.

23. Upon e-mail requests by Derek Dunlop to switch the date, Michael Birnie added to his initial ignorance by not accommodating Derek Dunlop's request to switch the date. It must be noted that if Michael Birnie was dealing with another person, lawyer, client, plaintiff and/or crown attorney that Michael Birnie would possess the professional courtesy to accommodate this request.
24. Michael Birnie has further exhibited his lack of professionalism toward Derek Dunlop by not responding to specific e-mails that Derek Dunlop has forwarded to Michael Birnie. All of this above noted maltreatment exhibited by Michael Birnie toward Derek Dunlop is intentionally biased, intentionally prejudicial, intentionally discriminatory and is unjust, unwarranted, undesired and oppressive to the Plaintiff.
25. Michael Birnie has intentionally involved himself in this matter knowing full well that he would only contribute to the on-going cover-ups, on-going crimes, on-going corruption, intentional injustices, purposeful miscarriage of justices and crimes that have been committed against Derek Dunlop.
26. Michael Birnie knows full well that Mike Hunter and members of the North Bay Police Service have committed numerous crimes against Derek Dunlop over the years. Michael Birnie is prepared and willing to contribute to the intentional on-going cover-ups against Derek Dunlop in order to do anything to protect and attempt to uphold the integrity, the credibility and the reputation of the North Bay Police Service.
27. Michael Birnie is also intelligent enough to realize that he should have never assumed the responsibilities, duties and obligations to represent the clients he has elected to represent in this matter.
28. Michael Birnie also knows that if Derek Dunlop possessed the power and the resources that the clients, Michael Birnie represents would be in jail themselves. As a result, Michael Birnie knows that by contributing to the cover-ups that he is also in the wrong on every single level imaginable.

Vanessa Glasser and Sara Blake

29. Vanessa Glasser is a civil law lawyer who is employed with the Ministry of the Attorney General of Ontario in the civil law department. It appears that after Vanessa Glasser's articling that she was hired by the Ministry of the Attorney General and this appears to be her first career position in her respective profession.
30. Sara Blake is a civil law attorney who is employed with the Ministry of the Attorney General in the civil law department. It is apparent that Sara Blake is a senior attorney in comparison to that of Vanessa Glasser.

31. Vanessa Glasser has intentionally implicated herself in the matter of Derek Dunlop vs. the North Bay Police Service et. al. Vanessa Glasser has done so knowing full well that her clients have committed pre-calculated crimes, set-ups, illegal actions, misconduct, improprieties, wrongdoings and transgressions which have been purposely pre-planned, pre-meditated and conducted against Derek Dunlop. As a result of intentionally involving herself, Vanessa Glasser is now a contributor to the on-going cover-ups, collusion, corruption, conspiracy and coercion that all continue to grow against Derek Dunlop.
32. Sara Blake has intentionally implicated herself in the matter of Derek Dunlop vs. the North Bay Police Service et. al. Sara Blake has done so knowing full well that her clients have committed pre-calculated crimes, set-ups, illegal actions, misconduct, improprieties, wrongdoings and transgressions which have been purposely pre-planned, pre-meditated and conducted against Derek Dunlop. As a result of intentionally involving herself, Sara Blake is now a contributor to the on-going cover-ups, collusion, corruption, conspiracy and coercion that all continue to grow against Derek Dunlop.
33. Vanessa Glasser is a lawyer who is employed by the Ministry of the Attorney General. Vanessa Glasser is currently defending the Ministry of the Attorney General in Derek Dunlop vs. the North Bay Police Service et al. This is a direct conflict of interest. It is not conceivably possible that an employee of the Ministry of the Attorney General be legally permitted to represent their employer. This is another enormous oversight and mistake on behalf of the government.
34. Sara Blake is a lawyer who is employed by the Ministry of the Attorney General. Sara Blake is currently defending the Ministry of the Attorney General in Derek Dunlop vs. the North Bay Police Service et al. This is a direct conflict of interest. It is not conceivably possible that an employee of the Ministry of the Attorney General be legally permitted to represent their employer. This is another enormous oversight and mistake on behalf of the government.
35. Vanessa Glasser has displayed her ignorance towards Derek Dunlop by exhibiting her lack of professionalism in many ways. Vanessa Glasser did not bother to contact Derek Dunlop to determine whether he would be available for a court date on June 1st, 2011. Vanessa Glasser and the other legal representatives in a collaborative effort just proceeded to schedule a court proceeding for June 1st, 2011 in the matter Derek Dunlop vs. the North Bay Police Service et al., without contacting Derek Dunlop, without consulting with Derek Dunlop, without confirming with Derek Dunlop and without asking Derek Dunlop whether he was or was not available. It must be noted that if Vanessa Glasser was dealing with another person, lawyer, client, plaintiff and/or crown attorney that Vanessa Glasser would possess the professional courtesy to contact the person in the first place.

36. Sara Blake has displayed her ignorance towards Derek Dunlop by exhibiting her lack of professionalism in many ways. Sara Blake did not bother to contact Derek Dunlop to determine whether he would be available for a court date on June 1st, 2011. Sara Blake and the other legal representatives in a collaborative effort just proceeded to schedule a court proceeding for June 1st, 2011 in the matter Derek Dunlop vs. the North Bay Police Service et al., without contacting Derek Dunlop, without consulting with Derek Dunlop, without confirming with Derek Dunlop and without asking Derek Dunlop whether he was or was not available. It must be noted that if Sara Blake was dealing with another person, lawyer, client, plaintiff and/or crown attorney that Sara Blake would possess the professional courtesy to contact the person in the first place. Sara Blake even possessed the audacity and gall to state in one of her e-mails that I was being uncooperative in relation to June 1st, 2011.
37. It is highly evident that Vanessa Glasser is unable to conduct herself in a manner that is free from and without prejudices towards Derek Dunlop, that is free from and without discriminations towards Derek Dunlop, that is free from and without biases towards Derek Dunlop.
38. It is highly evident that Sara Blake is unable to conduct herself in a manner that is free from and without prejudices towards Derek Dunlop, that is free from and without discriminations towards Derek Dunlop, that is free from and without biases towards Derek Dunlop.

Gillian Dingle and Patricia Jackson

39. Gillian Dingle is employed as a civil law lawyer with the law firm Torys, LLP.
40. Patricia Jackson is employed as a civil law lawyer with the law firm Torys, LLP.
41. Gillian Dingle has displayed her ignorance towards Derek Dunlop by exhibiting her lack of professionalism in many ways. Gillian Dingle did not bother to contact Derek Dunlop to determine whether he would be available for a court date on June 1st, 2011. Gillian Dingle and the other legal representatives in a collaborative effort just proceeded to schedule a court proceeding for June 1st, 2011 in the matter Derek Dunlop vs. the North Bay Police Service et al., without contacting Derek Dunlop, without consulting with Derek Dunlop, without confirming with Derek Dunlop and without asking Derek Dunlop whether he was or was not available. It must be noted that if Gillian Dingle was dealing with another person, lawyer, client, plaintiff and/or crown attorney that Gillian Dingle would possess the professional courtesy to contact the person in the first place.

42. Patricia Jackson has displayed her ignorance towards Derek Dunlop by exhibiting her lack of professionalism in many ways. Patricia Jackson did not bother to contact Derek Dunlop to determine whether he would be available for a court date on June 1st, 2011. Patricia Jackson and the other legal representatives in a collaborative effort just proceeded to schedule a court proceeding for June 1st, 2011 in the matter Derek Dunlop vs. the North Bay Police Service et al., without contacting Derek Dunlop, without consulting with Derek Dunlop, without confirming with Derek Dunlop and without asking Derek Dunlop whether he was or was not available. It must be noted that if Patricia Jackson was dealing with another person, lawyer, client, plaintiff and/or crown attorney that Patricia Jackson would possess the professional courtesy to contact the person in the first place.
43. It is highly evident that Gillian Dingle is unable to conduct herself in a manner that is free from and without prejudices towards Derek Dunlop, that is free from and without discriminations towards Derek Dunlop, that is free from and without biases towards Derek Dunlop.
44. It is highly evident that Patricia Jackson is unable to conduct herself in a manner that is free from and without prejudices towards Derek Dunlop, that is free from and without discriminations towards Derek Dunlop, that is free from and without biases towards Derek Dunlop.
45. Gillian Dingle has intentionally implicated herself in the matter of Derek Dunlop v. the North Bay Police Service et. al. Gillian Dingle has done so knowing full well that her clients have condoned the pre-calculated crimes, set-ups, illegal actions, misconduct, improprieties, wrongdoings and transgressions which have been purposely pre-planned, pre-meditated and conducted against Derek Dunlop. As a result of intentionally involving herself, Gillian Dingle is now a contributor to the on-going cover-ups, collusion, corruption, conspiracy and coercion that all continue to grow against Derek Dunlop.
46. Patricia Jackson has intentionally implicated herself in the matter of Derek Dunlop versus the North Bay Police Service et. al. Sara Blake has done so knowing full well that her clients have condoned the pre-calculated crimes, set-ups, illegal actions, misconduct, improprieties, wrongdoings and transgressions which have been purposely pre-planned, pre-meditated and conducted against Derek Dunlop. As a result of intentionally involving herself, Sara Blake is now a contributor to the on-going cover-ups, collusion, corruption, conspiracy and coercion that all continue to grow against Derek Dunlop.

Scott McIntyre

47. During my initial contact with Mr. Scott McIntyre on 21-Sep-10 it was obvious that Mr. Scott McIntyre had already formulated a pre-determined manner in which he was going to treat me. In an extremely mischievous, coy and disrespectful manner, Mr. Scott McIntyre carried out his pre-meditated plan. Mr. Scott McIntyre made it a critical point to initially ensure me that he was not part of any collusion. Mr. Scott McIntyre further went onto volunteer personal information that he was currently involved in a grievance process with his employer (Unprofessional conduct exhibited Scott McIntyre).
48. Next, Mr. Scott McIntyre stated that his agency did not possess the security capabilities of monitoring somebody. (This would suggested that Scott McIntyre was aware that I was being monitored. It is no secret that my every move is being monitored 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, whether Scott McIntyre or anyone else is willing to admit to this fact or not.
49. Mr. Scott McIntyre went onto to further disclose additional personal information to me. Mr. Scott McIntyre stated that he apologized as he was just catching up as he was just returning to the office from having some health issues with his ticker (I would have to assume that Mr. Scott McIntyre was making reference to his heart)
50. At one point during our meeting on 21-Sep-10, Mr. Scott McIntyre asked me if I had a lawyer assisting me? I informed him that I did not have a lawyer, because nobody in this community is willing to assist me. Next, Mr. Scott McIntyre asked me what about a lawyer outside of our jurisdiction, say Sudbury? I informed him that I had contacted over 200 lawyers outside of jurisdiction and they are unwilling to assist me for a variety of reasons.
51. Mr. Scott McIntyre asked a deliberate question and asked what about a paralegal? What about Maureen Boldt, I hear she is a pitbull? It was by no coincidence that I had just e-mailed Maureen Boldt on 20-Sep-11 about initiating an appeal in my matter that was recently before the court. It was obvious that Scott McIntyre did not just pull Maureen Boldt's name out of the blue. Scott McIntyre must have made this reference as a result of being informed by some member of the authorities that I had recently contacted Maureen Boldt. If Scott McIntyre and the member of the authorities believed that this was right than they are both in the wrong. Please keep in mind Scott McIntyre had informed me that he was not part of any collusion.
52. Next, Mr. Scott McIntyre made sure to point out that as files come into the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services that they are assigned on a rotating basis and that who ever is next in line to receive a case gets that matter. First, this is interesting to note that Ms. Patricia Maiangowi was initially assigned to my matter so I am unsure why she would not assuming my file.
53. Moreover, it is highly important to note that Scott McIntyre had had a probation order of mine since November 18th, 2009 and Scott McIntyre never had the decency or professional courtesy to contact me or to meet with me since November 18th, 2009. Please note that Scott McIntyre met with my mother but not myself.
54. Scott McIntyre also asked me a question about my father. Scott McIntyre asked me if my father was deceased. Scott McIntyre will need to clarify why he asked this question.
55. Scott McIntyre also volunteered and divulged private information about his children to me. Scott McIntyre informed me that his son plays Pee wee "AA" hockey for the North Bay Trappers and that his daughter plays ringuette for a Rep team is what I believe Scott McIntyre to have said.

56. Near the end of our meeting, Scott McIntyre prepared a business card of his outlining on the back of his business card the time and date of our next scheduled meeting. Scott McIntyre ensured to state, please be sure to bring this card back with me to our next meeting. This was extremely odd request and I would have to stated that Scott McIntyre was tipped off by some member of the authorities that I had brought the card that Natalie O'Brien had given me. Whether Scott McIntyre wants to admit to it or not, he had a recent discussion with somebody who would have informed him that I had put the card from Natalie O'Brien in my pocket.
57. Scott McIntyre was capable of treating me in such a dishonourable, disrespectful and unprofessional manner. Scott McIntyre possessed many pre-determined biases, prejudices and discriminations towards Derek Dunlop prior to taking him on as a client.
58. Nobody from the government has ever contacted me in relation to the serious, genuine, legitimate and important concerns that I possessed about the misconduct exhibited by Scott McIntyre in relation to me during our meeting on 21-Sep-10.

Dr. Jeff Phillips and Ron Lavigne

Subject: Meeting with Dr. Jeff Phillips and Mr. Ron Lavigne - October 28th, 2010.

59. I am writing to try to outline the main points of a meeting that occurred today, October 28th, 2010 from about 10:10am until about 11:25am at the North Bay Probation and Parole Office. At the onset of the meeting that transpired in a fairly large boardroom at the North Bay Probation and Parole Office with Dr. Jeff Phillips, Mr. Ron Lavigne and myself, I asked if the meeting was being audio-taped. I was informed by Mr. Ron Lavigne that the aforementioned meeting was not being audio-taped. At which time I politely requested that the meeting between the three parties be audio-taped. At which time, Mr. Ron Lavigne notified me that my request to have the meeting audio-taped would be denied. Mr. Ron Lavigne went onto further explain that no meetings between probation officers and their clients are audio-taped and/or taped. It must be noted that my request was to ensure that nothing is misconstrued or misinterpreted during this meeting now or in the future. I also made this request in order to hold each person including myself accountable and responsible for what transpired during the meeting. Finally, I made this request for the tape to act as a witness for all parties and I did not make this request for any improper purpose or reason. Furthermore, it must also be noted that I asked Dr. Jeff Phillips if he could note that my request was denied. Dr. Jeff Phillips noted that my request to have the meeting audio-taped was denied and I would suggest that Dr. Phillips may include this fact in his final report. It must be noted that the boardroom possessed the required and necessary equipment to audio-tape the meeting and I will suggest that it would have been a very minor process to set-up the existing equipment to audio-tape the meeting, however, this apparently was not an option. Audio-tape meetings would be beneficial for everyone involved.
60. As I have previously stated that there is virtually no validity, no credibility and/or no reliability to the report and assessment prepared by Dr. Jeff Phillips and this will always be a fact. Dr. Phillips discussed the findings with me and Dr. Phillips report has apparently generated two diametrically opposed hypothesis. I will once again state that for the reasons that I have previously indicated the findings and possible recommendations possess virtually no credibility and no reliability
61. It must be noted that Dr. Phillips permitted me to read a copy of his 11-page report with accompanying recommendations. During my initial perusal of said document pointed out certain information in Dr. Phillips report that was either incorrect, misinterpreted or slanted. Once again, I must note that Dr. Jeff Phillip's report is not credible and there are many, many other points that are extremely questionable in their merit for a variety of reasons.
62. As I have previously discussed with Mr. Ron Lavigne, I know that Mr. Lavigne is unable to remove these prejudices, biases and discriminations. Mr. Ron Lavigne would have developed these biases as a result of what transpired between myself and the North Bay Probation & Parole back in October- November of 2008. In

addition, Mr. Ron Lavigne's opinions, biases, prejudices and discriminations towards me would have been heavily influenced in a negative fashion as a result of the complaints, issues and concerns that I raised about the initial meeting with Mr. Scott McIntyre. There is absolutely no way that Mr. Ron Lavigne does not possess strong biases, prejudices and discriminations towards me. I would hope that Mr. Ron Lavigne would have the decency to realize that Mr. Ron Lavigne is unable to maintain an unbiased, impartial and non-prejudicial perspective when it comes to dealing with me.

63. I have continued to request that the government in conjunction with Ron Lavigne (North Bay Probation and Parole) work together to remove Ron Lavigne as my P. O.
64. Next, I am also going to respectfully submit a request to the government to inform me about the status about my complaint into the disrespectful, disgraceful, unwarranted and undesired misconduct of Mr. Scott McIntyre. I would appreciate a follow-up as I also want to know how I further can pursue this complaint process. Additionally, I want to further address my additional concerns that I made reference to in my initial complaint, but did not elaborate about those concerns at that time. I believe that these concerns are extremely serious in nature and need to be addressed as Mr. Scott McIntyre should have also refrained from making specific comments that Mr. Scott McIntyre made during our initial meeting.
65. Dr. Jeff Phillips had a pre-meditated and purposeful plan to follow conditions set out in probation orders that were, as a result of Justice Peter Wright and Justice Normand Glaude wanting to gain retribution against me as a result of having developed numerous biases, prejudices and discriminations towards me. These judges put these purposely put certain conditions in the probation orders as a result of a personal dislike for me. This once again displays the on-going collusion, cover-ups and conspiring against the Plaintiff.

Ron Lavigne

66. Mr. Ron Lavigne and Mr. Ron Lavigne only has notified me that he has been issued a directive that he will not be removed as my P. O. I have not been informed or heard this information from any member of the government, that in fact Mr. Ron Lavigne will not be removed as my P. O. This is an extremely, extremely serious request and people employed within the structure of the government do not even possess the decency to or courtesy to respond to my e-mail correspondences. Furthermore, Mr. Ron Lavigne has not provided me with any substantial reasons why he will not be removed as my P.O. other than the fact that it will not be happening.
67. Mr. Ron Lavigne possesses an incredible number of prejudices, biases and discriminations towards me that Mr. Ron Lavigne himself is unable to identify and admit to. Mr. Ron Lavigne also has hidden agendas against me whether he is willing to admit to these facts or not. Mr. Ron Lavigne ensures to state to me face-to-face that he has no issues with me as he again did yesterday on December 17th, 2010.
68. It must be noted that Mr. Ron Lavigne previously informed me on a least two prior occasions that he is not part of any collusion, conspiracy and/or cover-ups against me. (something to this effect). Moreover, it must also be noted that Mr. Ron Lavigne continues to portray to me that he wants to assist me but, nothing could be further from the truth.
69. As I have previously stated all of Mr. Ron Lavigne's diligent efforts are conducted in a purposeful manner to be detrimental toward me and to bring me down. A probation officer outside of jurisdiction needs to assume carriage of my file for a wide variety of reasons that I have previously stated and continue to state. This would be in the best interests of Mr. Ron Lavigne as well as he is totally unable to remain impartial especially considering the fact that he possesses hidden agendas against me.

70. During yesterday's meeting I decided that I would communicate with Mr. Ron Lavigne even though I am highly reluctant to do so. It was highly evident that Mr. Ron Lavigne had a pre-calculated plan to ensure that he obtained a signed consent for my family physician. Mr. Ron Lavigne has informed me that he wants me to speak to my family physician whether my family doctor may feel that I need to obtain some assistance for some possible mental health issues.
71. Mr. Ron Lavigne has discussed this with me in accordance to Dr. Jeff Phillip's report that apparently has 1 hypothesis that I have been wrongfully persecuted (as Mr. Lavigne likes to make reference to) and 1 hypothesis that Dr. Phillip's apparently has some recommendations that I may need some assistance for mental health issues. Please remember that any report of Dr. Jeff Phillip's possesses virtually no credibility, no validity and no reliability. It would be advisable for Dr. Jeff Phillip's not to attach his professional name to any report concerning myself. As I have stated before the results are spoiled.
72. I informed Mr. Ron Lavigne on December 17th, 2010 that my family doctor is Dr. Cuncins. Mr. Ron Lavigne said Oh, Chuck (something to this effect). Mr. Ron Lavigne informed me that the signed consent would be to discuss what was happening and not to obtain any of my medical records. I am going to suggest that this was a coy, deceitful plan to obtain my medical records. If this is actually the case and Mr. Ron Lavigne has a pre-meditated plan to assist the authorities in their plan to further their investigation, Mr. Ron Lavigne would definitely be in the wrong if there is a pre-meditated, collaborative plan to obtain medical records of mine and to inform me that the consent is not for those reasons. This would also display Mr. Ron Lavigne's biases, prejudices and discriminations. It would also exhibit Mr. Ron Lavigne's on-going conduct to bring me down. In addition, this also displays that Mr. Ron Lavigne is involved in the collusion against me even though Mr. Lavigne is also unwilling to admit to this fact as well.
73. It is interesting to note that Mr. Ron Lavigne did not have me sign the consent for Dr. Cuncins in his office. Mr. Ron Lavigne has me sign the consent in the waiting room after our meeting was over. In doing so, Mr. Ron Lavigne neglected to read the contents of the consent form to me, nor did Mr. Ron Lavigne read over its contents. In fact, Mr. Ron Lavigne did not even offer to read the contents of the consent to me. Mr. Ron Lavigne notified me that the consent was a reciprocal consent the permits Mr. Ron Lavigne to speak to Dr. Cuncins and Dr. Cuncins to speak to Ron Lavigne. Mr. Ron Lavigne must have had me sign the consent in the waiting room to have a staff member witness me signing it or because there were cameras to witness me signing it.
74. Mr. Ron Lavigne purposely befriended me on December 17th, 2010 and I would assume that this was a devilish ploy to illicit information from me. Mr. Lavigne asked me whether I would be travelling during the holidays and I informed him that I would not be travelling. I asked Mr. Lavigne whether he would be travelling and he stated that he was staying put. Mr. Ron Lavigne asked me if I was a skier and I informed that I snowboarded. Mr. Ron Lavigne went onto state that Jack Pine Hill would be opening soon. Mr. Ron Lavigne went on further and discussed Mt. Antoine in Mattawa, ON. Mr. Ron Lavigne asked me if I ice fished. I informed him that I had not done so in a long time but I had done so. I asked him if he ice fished and Mr. Ron Lavigne acknowledged that he did. There was an on-going dialogue about this subject for a couple of minutes.
75. Mr. Ron Lavigne had a pre-meditated and purposeful plan to follow conditions set out in probation orders that were as a result of Justice Peter Wright and Justice Normand Glaude wanting to gain retribution against me as a result of having developed numerous biases, prejudices and discriminations towards me. These judges put these purposely put certain conditions in the probation orders as a result of a personal dislike for me. This once again displays the on-going collusion, cover-ups and conspiring against the Plaintiff.

Andrew Hainsworth (Dominion Process Servers)

76. It is highly evident that Andrew Hainsworth was unable to conduct himself in a manner that is free from and without prejudices towards Derek Dunlop, that is free from and without discriminations towards Derek Dunlop, that is free from and without biases towards Derek Dunlop.
77. Andrew Hainsworth and employees with Dominion Process Server purposely involved themselves in the collusion against the Plaintiff. Andrew Hainsworth purposely served the Ministry of the Attorney General at an address that Andrew Hainsworth was not directed to by the Plaintiff, Derek Dunlop. Andrew Hainsworth and Glen Day purposely served the Ministry of the Attorney General in order to purposely be legally advantageous to the Ministry of the Attorney General. Andrew Hainsworth did this in a coy, strategic, manipulative manner that would make it appear that he wanted to assist the Plaintiff all the while he was purposely impacting the legal processes.
78. Andrew Hainsworth did not respond to e-mail correspondences by the Plaintiff as to why he served the Ministry of the Attorney General at an address the Plaintiff did not supply. Andrew Hainsworth purposely did this and knew that he was legally in the wrong when carrying out this process. Andrew Hainsworth knew that there were treating the Plaintiff unjustly, unfairly and improperly but proceeded with their plan anyways. Andrew Hainsworth would have believed that this would never come back on him and the Dominion Process Servers and that he would have be able to get away with this deceitful and dishonest plan.
79. Andrew Hainsworth has intentionally implicated himself in the matter of Derek Dunlop vs. the North Bay Police Service et. al. Andrew Hainsworth has done so knowing full well that the Defendants have committed pre-calculated crimes, set-ups, illegal actions, misconduct, improprieties, wrongdoings and transgressions which have been purposely pre-planned, pre-meditated and conducted against Derek Dunlop. As a result of intentionally involving himself, Andrew Hainsworth is now a contributor to the on-going cover-ups, collusion, corruption, conspiracy and coercion that all continue to grow against Derek Dunlop.

Ian Shago

80. It is highly evident that Ian Shago was unable to conduct himself in a manner that is free from and without prejudices towards Derek Dunlop, that is free from and without discriminations towards Derek Dunlop, that is free from and without biases towards Derek Dunlop.
81. Ian Shago was reluctant to serve the Statement of Claims in the matter of Derek Dunlop v. The North Bay Police Service et al. It is obvious that Ian Shago would possess some friendships and relationships with the members of the North Bay Police Service as a result of his position of employ.

82. Ian Shago was supposed to and had agreed to provide the Plaintiff with photocopies of the Affidavit of Services that he had filed with the Superior Court of Justice in the matter of Derek Dunlop v. the North Bay Police Service et al. The Plaintiff sent Ian Shago and other employees of the North Bay Bailiffs and Process Servers numerous correspondences about the 6 copies of the Affidavit of Services. Ian Shago did never the professional courtesy to respond to the correspondences of the Plaintiff and Ian Shago also never did provide a copy of the Affidavit of Services to the Plaintiff. Ian Shago purposely caused the Plaintiff undue stress. The lack of professionalism exhibited toward the Plaintiff was prejudicial, biased and discriminatory.
83. Ian Shago has intentionally implicated himself in the matter of Derek Dunlop vs. the North Bay Police Service et. al. Ian Shago has done so knowing full well that the defendants have committed pre-calculated crimes, set-ups, illegal actions, misconduct, improprieties, wrongdoings and transgressions which have been purposely pre-planned, pre-meditated and conducted against Derek Dunlop. As a result of intentionally involving himself, Ian Shago is now a contributor to the on-going cover-ups, collusion, corruption, conspiracy and coercion that all continue to grow against Derek Dunlop.

Alain Hacquard

84. Ever since the Plaintiff, Derek Dunlop was released from custody at the North Bay Courthouse on 27-Aug-10, employees of the North Bay Courthouse have been unable to treat the Plaintiff without prejudices, without biases and without discriminations. North Bay Courthouse staff were well aware that there was an on-going investigation into the affairs of the Plaintiff and that there were charges that were pending as a result. Due to these facts the North Bay Courthouse staff was unable to treat the Plaintiff properly, fairly and justly. The Courthouse staff will never admit to this.
85. The North Bay Courthouse Staff would be tipped off by the authorities prior to the Plaintiff attending the courthouse. The North Bay Courthouse Staff would be made aware of when the Plaintiff was attending the courthouse, why the Plaintiff was attending the courthouse and so on. The North Bay Courthouse Staff would have privileged information about the contents of the Plaintiff's court dockets and so forth. The North Bay Courthouse Staff will never admit to this and neither will the police authorities ever admit to this. These were all breaches of the Freedom of Privacy and Information Act and the North Bay Courthouse Staff is cognizant of these facts. The fact is that the North Bay Courthouse Staff was unable to prevent themselves in the on-going collusion, cover-ups, and corruption against the Plaintiff. They all know that there were and are in the wrong, however, they will never admit to this either.
86. Alain Hacquard has intentionally implicated himself in the matter of Derek Dunlop vs. the North Bay Police Service et. al. Alain Hacquard has done so knowing full well that her clients have committed pre-calculated crimes, set-ups, illegal actions, misconduct, improprieties, wrongdoings and transgressions which have been purposely pre-planned, pre-meditated and conducted against Derek Dunlop. As a result of intentionally involving himself, Alain Hacquard is now a contributor to the on-going cover-ups, collusion, corruption, conspiracy and coercion that all continue to grow against Derek Dunlop.

87. It is highly evident that Alain Hacquard is unable to conduct himself in a manner that is free from and without prejudices towards Derek Dunlop, that is free from and without discriminations towards Derek Dunlop, that is free from and without biases towards Derek Dunlop.
88. Alain Hacquard has intentionally involved himself in the collusion against the Plaintiff in a manner that would be legally advantageous to the defendants in Derek Dunlop v. The North Bay Police Service et. al. Alain Hacquard abuses his knowledge to manipulate civil law processes that are a disadvantage to the Plaintiff's law suit. Alain Hacquard is well aware that he abuses this knowledge and purposely is causing the Plaintiff undue stress. Alain Hacquard during these manipulative strategies has purposely cost the Plaintiff additional monies that the Plaintiff would not have had to afford and endure if it were not for the mind games of Alain Hacquard. Alain Hacquard did have prior knowledge of Derek Dunlop attending the North Bay Courthouse and had a pre-calculated game plan that would be detrimental to the Plaintiff prior to the Plaintiff's attendance in court.
89. Alain Hacquard has not had the professional courtesy and the professional decency to respond to the Plaintiff's correspondences about providing the Plaintiff with written confirmation about previous discussions and the information that Alain Hacquard has provided to the Plaintiff. It is obvious that Alain Hacquard is fearful to respond in writing and has been intentionally instructed not to respond to the Plaintiff in writing.

Michelle Ryan

90. Ever since the Plaintiff, Derek Dunlop was released from custody at the North Bay Courthouse on 27-Aug-10, Michelle Ryan, court staff with the North Bay Courthouse has been unable to treat the Plaintiff without prejudices, without biases and without discriminations. Michelle Ryan and other staff were well aware that there was an on-going investigation into the affairs of the Plaintiff and that there were charges that were pending as a result. Due to these facts Michelle Ryan was unable to treat the Plaintiff properly, fairly and justly. Michelle Ryan and the North Bay Courthouse staff will never admit to this.
91. Michelle Ryan would be tipped off by the authorities prior to the Plaintiff attending the courthouse. The North Bay Courthouse Staff would be made aware of when the Plaintiff was attending the courthouse, why the Plaintiff was attending the courthouse and so on. The North Bay Courthouse Staff would have privileged information about the contents of the Plaintiff's court dockets and so forth. The North Bay Courthouse Staff will never admit to this and neither will the police authorities ever admit to this. These were all breaches of the Freedom of Privacy and Information Act and the North Bay Courthouse Staff is cognizant of these facts. The fact is that the North Bay Courthouse Staff was unable to prevent themselves in the on-going collusion, cover-ups, and corruption against the Plaintiff. They all know that there were and are in the wrong, however, they will never admit to this either.

92. Michelle Ryan has intentionally implicated herself in the matter of Derek Dunlop vs. the North Bay Police Service et. al. Michelle Ryan has done so knowing full well that the defendants have committed pre-calculated crimes, set-ups, illegal actions, misconduct, improprieties, wrongdoings and transgressions which have been purposely pre-planned, pre-meditated and conducted against Derek Dunlop. As a result of intentionally involving herself, Michelle Ryan is now a contributor to the on-going cover-ups, collusion, corruption, conspiracy and coercion that all continue to grow against Derek Dunlop. Michelle Ryan knows that what she has involved herself in is wrong.
93. It is highly evident that Michelle Ryan is unable to conduct herself in a manner that is free from and without prejudices towards Derek Dunlop, that is free from and without discriminations towards Derek Dunlop, that is free from and without biases towards Derek Dunlop.
94. Michelle Ryan abuses her knowledge to manipulate legal processes and court processes that are a disadvantage to the Plaintiff's legal matters. Michelle Ryan is well aware that she abuses this knowledge and has purposely caused the Plaintiff undue stress. Michelle Ryan during these manipulative strategies has purposely cost the Plaintiff additional monies that the Plaintiff would not have had to afford and endure if it were not for the mind games of Michelle Ryan.

Justice of the Peace, Michel Moreau and Justice of the Peace Michael Kitlar

95. Ever since the Plaintiff, Derek Dunlop was released from custody at the North Bay Courthouse on 27-Aug-10, the Justice of the Peaces at the North Bay Courthouse have been unable to treat the Plaintiff without prejudices, without biases and without discriminations. The Justice of the Peaces were well aware that there was an on-going investigation into the affairs of the Plaintiff and that there were charges that were pending as a result. Due to these facts the Justice of the Peace's Office were unable to treat the Plaintiff properly, fairly and justly. The Justice of the Peaces will never admit to this.
96. The Justice of the Peaces would be tipped off by the authorities prior to the Plaintiff attending the courthouse. The Justice of the Peaces would be made aware of when the Plaintiff was attending the courthouse, why the Plaintiff was attending the courthouse and so on. The Justice of the Peaces would have privileged information about the contents of the Plaintiff's court dockets and so forth. The Justice of the Peaces will never admit to this and neither will the police authorities ever admit to this. These were all breaches of the Freedom of Privacy and Information Act and the North Bay Courthouse Staff is cognizant of these facts. The fact is that the Justice of the Peace Staff were unable to prevent themselves in the on-going collusion, cover-ups, and corruption against the Plaintiff. They all know that there were and are in the wrong, however, they will never admit to this either.
97. It is highly evident that Justice of the Peace, Michel Moreau is unable to conduct himself in a manner that is free from and without prejudices towards Derek Dunlop, that is free from and without discriminations towards Derek Dunlop, that is free from and without biases towards Derek Dunlop.

98. It is highly evident that Justice of the Peace, Michael Kitlar is unable to conduct himself in a manner that is free from and without prejudices towards Derek Dunlop, that is free from and without discriminations towards Derek Dunlop, that is free from and without biases towards Derek Dunlop.
99. Justice of the Peace, Michel Moreau has intentionally implicated himself in the cover-ups, collusion, corruption, conspiracy and coercion against Derek Dunlop. knowing full well that crimes, set-ups, illegal actions, misconduct, improprieties, wrongdoings and transgressions have been intentionally and purposely conducted against Derek Dunlop. As a result of intentionally involving himself, Justice of the Peace, Michel Moreau is a contributor to the on-going cover-ups, collusion, corruption, conspiracy and coercion that continues to grow against Derek Dunlop.
100. Justice of the Peace, Michael Kitlar has intentionally implicated himself in the cover-ups, collusion, corruption, conspiracy and coercion against Derek Dunlop. knowing full well that crimes, set-ups, illegal actions, misconduct, improprieties, wrongdoings and transgressions have been intentionally and purposely conducted against Derek Dunlop. As a result of intentionally involving himself, Justice of the Peace, Michael Kitlar is a contributor to the on-going cover-ups, collusion, corruption, conspiracy and coercion that continues to grow against Derek Dunlop.
101. As a result of knowing what court documents and court dockets that the Plaintiff would be bringing to the North Bay Courthouse both Justice of the Peace, Michel Moreau and Justice of the Peace, Michael Kitlar would play mind games with the Plaintiff. First of all this is not professional and it is treatment that is unfair, unjust, unwarranted, prejudicial, biased and discriminatory to the Plaintiff. Next, these types of behaviors are not intelligent given the world of technology that we live in and it is also not very mature coming from a couple people employed as Justice of the Peaces in the Northeast Region. Both Michel Moreau and Michael Kitlar will never admit to this either.

Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms Violations and Deprivations.

102. As a result of the breach of the Plaintiff's rights and freedoms under sections 7, 9, 10, 11(b), 11(d), 11(e), 12, 15(1) and 24(1) of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, constitutional damages are an appropriate and just remedy in these circumstances of this particular matter having regard for the fulfilment of financial compensation, vindication of the right and deterrence of any future breaches as established and provided by the remedies available under sections 24(1) of the Charter.
103. The Plaintiff states that the Defendants are additionally liable for violations of the Plaintiff's rights pursuant to Sections 7 and 12 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, by virtue of the facts pleaded aforesaid.
104. In particular, the Plaintiff states that contrary to Section 7 of the Charter, the Plaintiff was deprived and denied of his rights to security of the person in a manner the contravened the principles of fundamental justice. Furthermore, the Plaintiff states that he was intentionally subjected, contrary to Section 12 of the Charter, to cruel and unusual treatment by virtue of the misconduct of the Defendants.

Other Intentional Injustices committed against the Plaintiff by the Defendants

105. On the basis of all of the above, the Plaintiff states that the defendants breached their duty to be fundamentally fair and act in a Bona Fide and honest fashion toward the Plaintiff.

Summation

106. The Plaintiff states that he has suffered damages as a result of the actions of the Defendants. The Plaintiff states that he is entitled to the interlocutory and permanent relief as requested in paragraph 1 hereof.
107. The Plaintiff states that there are sufficient circumstances set out in this claim to justify an thorough, comprehensive and extensive investigation into acts carried out by all the Defendants.
108. The Plaintiff states that the actions of the Defendants, as set out in this claim, amount to conduct which is reprehensible, oppressive and unfairly prejudicial to the Plaintiff and is conduct which unfairly disregards the plaintiff's interests.
109. The Plaintiff asks that the trial of this action take place in a neutral jurisdiction outside of the Province of Ontario.

May 19th, 2011

*Derek Dunlop
401-295 Lakeshore Dr.
North Bay, ON
P1A 3N8
(705) 495-6377*

FORM 4C
Courts of Justice Act
BACKSHEET

DEBIL DUNLOP PLAINTIFF
(Short title of proceeding) MICHAEL BOWE ET AL DEFENDANTS

(Court file no.) CV - 14-5179

(Name of Court) SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
PROCEEDING COMMENCED AT (place) NORTH BAY, ONTARIO
(Title of document) STATEMENT OF CLAIM
(if affidavit, indicate name of deponent and date sworn)

(Name, address, telephone number and fax number of lawyer or party) DEBIL DUNLOP
404-295 LALESNIKE DR.
NORTH BAY, ONTARIO
(Law society registration number of lawyer) PALLA SUB (705) 495-6377

(Fax number, if known, of person on whom document is to be served)