

02-MAR-12

MR. EGMHART EHLERS
401 BAY STREET
SUITE 1608
TORONTO, ONTARIO
M5H 2Y4

DEAR MR. EHLERS:

I AM WRITING TO YOU TO NOTIFY YOU ABOUT THE DISPLEASURES THAT I POSSESS IN RELATION TO THE UNFAIR, UNJUST AND UNREASONABLE TREATMENT THAT MEMBERS OF OUR JUSTICE SYSTEM INTENTIONALLY AND PURPOSELY DIRECT TOWARDS ME ON AN ON-GOING BASIS. THESE LEGAL PROFESSIONALS AND JUDICIARIES HAVE PRE-MEDITATED PLANS TO PURPOSEFULLY CAUSE ME INTENTIONAL HARM AND INSURIES. THESE PROMINENT DIGNITARIES INTENTIONALLY ABUSE THEIR POWERS AND AUTHORITIES THAT ARE BESTOWED UPON THEM TO BE INTENTIONALLY DETRIMENTAL TO ME. AS A RESULT OF THE ON-GOING, NEVER-ENDING COVER-UPS, COLLUSION AND CORRUPTION THAT THESE LEGAL AND JUDICIAL OFFICIALS ENGAGE THEMSELVES IN, THEY IN TURN CONTINUE TO TREAT ME WITH PRE JUDICES, WITH BIASES AND WITH DISCRIMINATIONS THAT ARE ALMOST INFINITE AT THIS POINT. SINCE PEOPLE HAVE THE INTENT TO PURPOSEFULLY COVER-UP FOR THEIR COLLEAGUES AND/OR FELLOW PROFESSIONALS THEY ARE UNABLE TO TREAT ME PROPERLY.

ON 07-MAR-12 AT ABOUT 9:00AM, I SPOKE TO YOU BY TELEPHONE IN THE VIDEO-COURT ROOM AT THE CENTRAL NORTH CORRECTIONAL CENTRE AND YOU WERE IN A BARRIE COURTROOM. DURING THIS TELEPHONE CONVERSATION YOU NOTIFIED ME THAT THE CROWN ATTORNEY WANTED 30 DAYS OF IN CUSTODY TIME IF I ENTERED A PLEA AND YOU BELIEVED THAT YOU HAD GOT THAT INFORMATION FROM MR. GARY ENLIS. MR. ENLIS YOU STATED THAT YOU COULD BRING ME TO PLEA COURT IN BARRIE ON MONDAY MARCH 12TH, 2012 AND IF I DECIDED TO ENTER A PLEA THAT I WOULD PROBABLY BE RELEASED ON TIME SERVED FROM THE COURT ON MONDAY MARCH 12TH, 2012.

ON MONDAY MARCH 12TH, 2012 YOU CONVINCED ME TO GO FORWARD WITH ANOTHER CROWN RESOLUTION MEETING FOR FRIDAY MARCH 16TH, 2012 AT 2:30PM. YOU ALSO SUGGESTED TO BRING MY MATTER BACK BEFORE THE COURT ON MONDAY MARCH 19TH, 2012, HOWEVER, YOU ADVISED AND SUGGESTED TO REMAIN MY MATTER AND KEEP IT IN PLEA COURT. I AM UNSURE WHY YOU HAVE DONE THIS BUT I WILL SUGGEST IT WILL NOT BE ADVANTAGEOUS TO ME. FURTHERMORE, THE FACT THAT YOU SCHEDULED THE CROWN RESOLUTION MEETING SO LATE ON A FRIDAY AFTERNOON THAT DID NOT PROVIDE ME AN OPPORTUNITY TO FIND OUT WHAT TRANSPIRED IN THAT MEETING PRIOR TO COURT ON THE 19-MAR-12.

AT COURT ON THE 19-MAR-12, YOU JUST BROUGHT ME UP INTO COURTROOM #9 AT THE BARRIE COURTHOUSE WITHOUT NOTIFYING ME WHAT THE CROWN'S POSITION FROM THE CROWN RESOLUTION MEETING ON 16-MAR-12 WAS. IT WAS NOT UNTIL I WAS IN THE PRISONER'S BOX INSIDE COURTROOM #9 THAT YOU INFORMED ME THAT THE BARRIE CROWN ATTORNEY WAS SEEKING 9 MONTHS OF CUSTODY TIME AND THAT THEY WERE ALSO SEEKING A 30-DAY ASSESSMENT, BUT THAT WE COULD TALK ABOUT THIS LATER. YOU ALSO NOTIFIED ME THAT YOU WERE GOING TO SET A JUDICIAL PRE-TRIAL DATE FOR THE 30-APR-12 WITHOUT EVEN ASKING ME IF I WANTED TO ACCEPT THE DEAL OR NOT. YOU ALSO INFORMED ME THAT THE 30-APR-12 WAS THE EARLIEST DATE YOU HAD AVAILABLE.

FIRST OF ALL THE 9 MONTHS OF CUSTODY TIME IS AN ENORMOUS DISCREPANCY FROM THE 30 DAYS OF CUSTODY TIME, INITIALLY OFFERED IN THE FIRST CROWN RESOLUTION. THE BARRIE CROWN AND YOURSELF ARE NOW ATTEMPTING TO COVER-UP THE INITIAL OFFER OF 30 DAYS OF CUSTODY TIME BY SAYING THAT THE CROWN WAS REFERENCING A 30-DAY ASSESSMENT AND NOT 30 DAYS OF CUSTODY TIME. THE BARRIE CROWN IS LYING AND YOU'RE ASSISTING THEM. MR. GARY EADIE NEVER INFORMED ME THAT THERE WAS AN OUTCOME AND/OR CROWN POSITION FROM HIS MEETING WITH THE BARRIE CROWN ATTORNEY.

AT THE BARRIE COURTHOUSE ON 19-MAR-12, I WAS SUPPOSED TO HAVE A BAIL HEARING. TO MY KNOWLEDGE I WAS UNAWARE OF ANY BAIL PROCEEDINGS IN RELATION TO MYSELF. IF THE BARRIE CROWN ATTORNEY AND YOURSELF OR

THE BARRIE CROWN ATTORNEY AND A DUTY COUNSEL, OR ANY MEMBERS OF THE JUSTICE SYSTEM PURPOSELY CONDUCTED A BAIL HEARING OR BAIL PROCEEDINGS IN MY ABSENCE THIS WILL BE WRONG ON EVERY SINGLE LEVEL IMAGINABLE. PLEASE NOTIFY ME WHETHER THIS DID TRANSPIRE WITHOUT MY ATTENDANCE.

DURING OUR INITIAL CONVERSATION OVER THE TELEPHONE, YOU ASKED ME IF I HAD A PREVIOUS ISSUE WITH BAIL, DUE TO OUR LIMITED CONTACT I WAS UNABLE TO CLARIFY MY RESPONSE. AS FAR AS I KNOW AFTER BEING RELEASED ON BAIL FOR ALMOST 3 YEARS I DID NOT HAVE ISSUES WITH THE COURT AS I WAS NOT CHARGED WITH A BREACH OF BAIL AND/OR BREACH OF MY RECOGNIZANCE WHEN I DID INCUR OTHER CHARGES IN NORTH BAY, ONTARIO ON THE 25-AUG-09. I TRULY HOPE THAT YOU HAVEN'T INTENTIONALLY USED THIS INFORMATION AGAINST ME IN AN ADVERSE FASHION IN ANY BAIL PROCEEDINGS OR ANY OTHER COURT PROCEEDINGS IN BARRIE COURT ON THE 19-MAR-12, WITHOUT MY ATTENDANCE AND WITHOUT MY KNOWLEDGE.

ON OR-MAR-12 I WROTE YOU A 4-PAGED LETTER ASKING YOU TO REPRESENT MY BEST INTERESTS IN A GENUINE, LOYAL, LEGITIMATE AND HONEST MANNER. IT IS EVIDENT THAT YOU HAVE TAKEN A POSITION TO INTENTIONALLY JUMP ABOARD THE SINGLE LARGEST CASE OF COLLUSION, CORRUPTION AND COVER-UPS IN THE HISTORY OF OUR CANADIAN JUDICIAL SYSTEM. INSTEAD OF DOING WHAT IS RIGHT YOU HAVE CHOSEN TO PURPOSELY TREAT ME WITH PREJUDICES, WITH BIASES AND WITH DISCRIMINATIONS. SOMEDAY, SOMEWHERE, SOMEONE HAS TO COME FORWARD WITH THE TRUTH AND ADMIT TO WHAT EACH AND EVERY PERSON HAS DONE. UNTIL THAT DAY, EACH AND EVERY PERSON WHO ATTEMPTS TO COVER-UP FOR SOMEBODY ELSE, THEY WILL ALSO BE IN THE WRONG.

IT ALSO APPEARS THAT IN A SLY COY AND MANIPULATIVE MANNER THAT YOU ARE PURPOSELY WORKING AGAINST ME TO INTENTIONALLY DISCREDIT MY MENTAL HEALTH. YOU KNOW AND I KNOW THIS IS A PLOY AND A PRE-MEDITATED PLAN OF OTHER JUDICIARIES, LEGAL OFFICIALS, CROWN ATTORNEYS AND SO FORTH. JUSTICE PETER WRIGHT AND JUSTICE NORMAND GELIBBE HAVE INTENTIONALLY ENGAGED THEMSELVES IN ATTEMPTING TO INTENTIONALLY DISCREDIT MY MENTAL HEALTH. THEY HAVE PURPOSELY ABUSED THEIR POWERS AND ISSUED SPECIFIC ORDERS CONCERNING MY MENTAL HEALTH.

JUSTICE WRIGHT AND JUSTICE GLAUDE HAVE PURPOSELY ISSUED THESE ATTORNEY-DENIED ORDERS IN ACCORDANCE TO A COOPERATIVE PLAN TO COVER-UP FOR OTHER PROMINENT LAWYERS, CROWN ATTORNEYS, POLICE OFFICERS, THEMSELVES AND SO FORTH.

IT IS EVIDENT THAT YOU ALSO MAY POSSESS AT LEAST ONE CONFLICT OF INTEREST (S) IN THIS MATTER AS YOU HAVE HAD INVOLVEMENT ON A PROFESSIONAL AND LEGAL LEVEL WITH MR. DEREK WIDDICKS WHO IS AN EMPLOYEE WITH SIMCOE C. A. S. OR HAS BEEN IN THE PAST.

AS OF THE 19-MAR-12 I WAS INFORMED BY YOU FOR THE FIRST TIME THE MONETARY AMOUNT THAT THE CROWN WAS SEEKING FOR BAIL. YOU TOLD ME THAT THEY WOULD BE ASKING FOR \$5,000.00 BAIL.

EACH AND EVERY ONE OF MY MATTERS THAT HAS BEEN BEFORE THE HONOURABLE COURT SINCE THE 20-FEB-05 HAS HAD SOME DIRECT AND/OR INDIRECT RELATION TO ONE ANOTHER. I ATTEMPT TO FOLLOW PROPER LEGAL PROCESS AND PROCEDURES BY HIRING A LAWYER TO REPRESENT MY BEST INTERESTS. IT IS EVIDENT THAT THE LAWYERS I OBTAIN, SECURE AND RETAIN HAVE A PURPOSEFUL INTENT TO CAUSE ME FURTHER HARM, INJURIES AND LOSSES. THESE ATTORNEYS INVOLVE THEMSELVES IN COLLUSION, COVER-UPS, CRIMES AND CORRUPTION IN ORDER TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE INJUSTICES AGAINST ME.

IF YOU FEEL SO INCLINED TO CONTINUE TO REPRESENT ME I WILL INSTRUCT MEMBERS OF YOUR FIRM AND YOURSELF TO DILIGENTLY ATTEMPT TO TRACK DOWN AND LOCATE THE WITNESSES ON THE LIST I HAVE PROVIDED. IT IS ABSURD, LUDICROUS AND RIDICULOUS TO JUMP ABOARD THIS TRAVESTY.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION TO THIS LETTER.

YOURS TRULY,



DEREK DUNLOP -

CENTRAL NORTH CORRECTIONAL CENTRE - RANCE 4 C.
1501 FULLER AVENUE
PENITENTIARY DISTRICT OF ONTARIO
L9M 2H4

- IDENTICAL COPIES :
- ① THE LAW SOCIETY OF UPPER CANADA
 - ② SENIOR BARRE CROWN ATTORNEY - KEVIN SISK
 - ③ LEGAL AID ONTARIO - PHARLIE OFFICE
 - ④ MR. GARY LADIE
 - ⑤ MR. PETER DUNLOP

Direct Line: (416) 947-3310
Toll Free: 1-800-268-7568
Facsimile Number: (416) 947-5263
E-Mail: comail@lsuc.on.ca



The Law Society of
Upper Canada | Barreau
du Haut-Canada

Osgoode Hall
130 Queen Street West
Toronto, Ontario
M5H 2N6

Complaints Services
Client Service Centre

April 10, 2012

PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL

Derek Dunlop
Central North Correctional Centre
Range 1-C
1501 Fuller Avenue
Penetanguishene, Ontario L9M 2N4

Dear Mr. Dunlop:

Re: Our File Number 2012-106759 - Eginhart Leonas Ehlers

Thank you for your correspondence, which we received on April 4, 2012.

Your letter will be assigned to one of our staff, who will carefully review it and may contact you. While we realize the importance of a quick response, we also need to take the time to ensure that your letter is given the attention it deserves. Normally, we will contact you or respond to you in approximately 30 days, depending on the type of issue or inquiry. If you have any questions in the meantime, please call us at 416-947-3310 or 1-800-268-7568 and one of our Client Service Representatives will be pleased to assist you. Please quote your file number when calling about your complaint. Please also provide your full name, address and telephone number, if you have not already done so.

If your letter contains a complaint about a lawyer or licensed paralegal, we may need to send a copy of the letter of complaint to the lawyer or paralegal involved, or to contact the lawyer or paralegal to discuss the complaint. If you object to this, please tell us immediately. In some cases, however, it may be necessary for us to proceed with your complaint and contact the lawyer or paralegal involved – even without your consent.

If the purpose of your letter is to ask a question rather than to file a complaint, or if your complaint is about something that is not within our mandate to deal with, a Complaints Services Representative will contact you. If we cannot answer your question, we will try to give you information about other resources that may be able to help you. You should know that the Law Society cannot provide legal advice or legal services to the public. We also cannot comment on a complaint about a lawyer or paralegal without having the name of the lawyer or paralegal you are complaining about, and specific details about the complaint. Please refer to the enclosed sheet, "The Law Society's Complaints Process", for further information about our complaints process, and issues that do not fall within our mandate.

Yours sincerely,

Complaints Services
Client Service Centre

Encl.



The Law Society of
Upper Canada

Barreau
du Haut-Canada

Osgoode Hall
130 Queen Street West
Toronto, Ontario
M5H 2N6

Professional Regulation
Division
Intake Department

May 9, 2012

Private & Confidential

Derek James Arthur Dunlop
Central North Correctional Centre
Range 1-C
1501 Fuller Avenue
Penetanguishene, Ontario L9M 2N4

Dear Mr. Dunlop:

Re: Subject: Eginhart Leonas Ehlers
Complainant: Derek James Arthur Dunlop
Case No.: 2012-106759

I have reviewed your complaint, which was received by the Intake Department of the Professional Regulation Division on April 12, 2012.

For efficient processing, any future communications you have with the Intake Department of the Professional Regulation Division should refer to Eginhart Leonas Ehlers and the case number, as set out above.

In order to proceed further with any regulatory issues that may arise from your complaint, we require additional information from you. Please provide **copies** of the following information and/or documentation to me by **May 30, 2012**:

- Evidence that you retained Mr. Ehlers for your criminal law matter such as:
 - Copy of the legal aid certificate or written retainer agreement
 - Copy of the Information
 - Correspondence from Mr. Ehlers
- Copy of your four page letter to Mr. Ehlers dated March 2, 2012
- Provide clarify who Mr. Derek Widdicks is how he relates to your criminal law matter
- Provide further details about how Mr. Ehlers has a conflict because of prior "involvement on a professional and legal level with Mr. Derek Widdicks"

Please note that if I do not receive the above from you by **May 30, 2012**, I will review the file and determine whether the information provided enables me to proceed further with an investigation. If not, the file may be closed.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions about this letter.

Yours truly,



Miko Dubiansky
Counsel

Telephone: (416) 947-3300, ext. 2084

Facsimile: (416) 947-3382

Email: mdubians@lsuc.on.ca



The Law Society of
Upper Canada

Barreau
du Haut-Canada

Osgoode Hall
130 Queen Street West
Toronto, Ontario
M5H 2N6

Tel: (416) 947-4055
Fax: (416) 947-5256

Complaints Resolution
Department
Professional Regulation

Cynthia Ansari
Administrative Assistant

June 1, 2012

Private & Confidential

Derek Dunlop
Central North Correctional Centre
Range 1-C
1501 Fuller Avenue
Penetanguishene, Ontario L9M 2N4

Dear Mr. Dunlop:

**Re: Lawyer: Eginhart Ehlers
Complainant: Derek Dunlop
Case No.: 2012-106759**

The Complaints Resolution Department received your complaint materials and file from the Intake Department on June 1, 2012.

This matter has been assigned to Chandi Syed (Complaints Resolution Counsel) who will review the material and information you provided. Please send copies not originals of any additional material and information you want considered as part of your complaint to Ms Syed. Ms Syed can be reached at (416)947-5215 or csyed@lsuc.on.ca

You will be contacted within 30 days of the date of this letter with more information about process steps and timelines.

Please advise us if, given your needs, you require Law Society of Upper Canada communications in an alternate format that is accessible, or if you require other arrangements to make Law Society services accessible to you.

Yours very truly,

Cynthia Ansari
Administrative Assistant



The Law Society of
Upper Canada | Barreau
du Haut-Canada

July 4, 2012

Private & Confidential

Derek Dunlop
Central North Correctional Centre
Range 1-C
1501 Fuller Avenue
Penetanguishene, Ontario L9M 2N4

Osgoode Hall
130 Queen Street West
Toronto, Ontario
M5H 2N6

Tel: (416)947-5215
Fax: (416)947-5256

Complaints Resolution Department
Professional Regulation

Chandi Syed
Complaints Resolution Counsel

csyed@lsuc.on.ca

Dear Mr. Dunlop:

Re: Lawyer: Eginhart Ehlers
Complainant: Derek Dunlop
Case No. 2012-106759

I have received your June 19, 2012 letter and enclosures. I have shared these documents with the Lawyer for his review.

As indicated to you in my letter dated June 7, 2012, the Lawyer has been provided with your complaint materials and thus, the details of your complaint. The regulatory issues that were instructed for investigation pursuant to subsection 49.3 (2) of the *Law Society Act* were set out in that letter. The Law Society did not proceed with the allegation of the Lawyer being in a conflict of interest vis-à-vis Derek Widdicks, an employee with the Children's Aid Society, because there was insufficient evidence of conflict.

Please note that I will be contacting you again once I have received and reviewed the Lawyer's response to the complaint. I will be sharing his response with you and will request your further comments.

Yours very truly,

Chandi Syed
Complaints Resolution Counsel

CS/ca

09-AUG-12

CHANDI SYED, COMPLAINTS RESOLUTION COUNSEL
THE LAW SOCIETY OF UPPER CANADA
130 QUEEN STREET WEST
TORONTO, ONTARIO M5H 2N6

RE: LAWYER: EGINHART EHLERS
COMPLAINANT: DEREK DUNLOP
CASE NO: 202-106759

DEAR MS. SYED:

I AM WRITING TO YOU IN RESPONSE TO YOUR LETTER DATED THE 01-AUG-12. I DO GREATLY APPRECIATE THE FACT THAT THE LAW SOCIETY NEEDS TO ADEQUATELY AND PROPERLY INVESTIGATE MY COMPLAINT IN ACCORDANCE TO YOUR AGENCY'S STANDARDS AND PROTOCOLS. FURTHERMORE, I UNDERSTAND THAT AS PART OF A FAIR AND JUST PROCESS THAT THERE ARE SPECIFIC GUIDELINES YOUR ORGANIZATION MUST ADHERE TO AND ABIDE BY. MY CONCERNS AND RESERVATIONS ARE IN RELATION TO THE CASE NOTES THAT I FORWARDED TO THE LAW SOCIETY AND THE FACT THAT SAID CASE NOTES WERE IMMEDIATELY SHARED WITH MR. EHLERS. ONCE AGAIN, I WANT TO RE-ITERATE THAT THESE CASE NOTES WERE PRIVATE AND PRIVILEGED AND I AM OF THE FIRM BELIEF THAT AT THE TIME THAT I PROVIDED THE CASE NOTES TO YOUR AGENCY THAT THEY SHOULD NOT HAVE BEEN DISCLOSED TO MR. EHLERS. I WOULD HAVE THOUGHT THAT UNTIL THE LAW SOCIETY HAD RECEIVED MR. EHLERS INITIAL RESPONSES TO MY COMPLAINT LETTER DATED THE 22-MAR-12 THAT THE AFOREMENTIONED CASE NOTES WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN SHARED WITH MR. EHLERS. ADDITIONALLY, YOU HAVE REFERENCED IN A "BULLET POINT" IN YOUR LETTER THAT WE MUST SHARE SOME OR ALL OF THE INFORMATION WITH THE LAWYER YOU ARE COMPLAINING ABOUT. IN RESPECT TO THAT STATEMENT, IT SUGGESTS THAT IT IS NOT A REQUIREMENT TO SHARE EVERYTHING WITH THE LAWYER (IE MR. EGINHART EHLERS) AND I DO NOT BELIEVE MY CASE NOTES SHOULD HAVE BEEN SUBMITTED TO MR. EHLERS AT THAT JUNCTURE OF THE INVESTIGATION.

AT THIS POINT, IT IS EXTREMELY ODD THAT MR. EHLERS HAS NOT RESPONDED TO

YOUR REQUEST BY THE 29-JUN-12. AT THIS TIME, I WILL STATE THAT THERE ARE NUMEROUS ALTERNATE HYPOTHESES AS TO WHY MR. ENLERS MAY NOT HAVE RESPONDED. FIRST, THERE IS A HIGH POTENTIAL THAT THERE MAY BE OTHER ADDITIONAL COVER-UPS TRANSPIRING IN ORDER TO TRY AND PROTECT AND COVER-UP FOR MR. ENLERS' MISCONDUCT. SECOND, ANOTHER HYPOTHESIS IS THAT MR. ENLERS IS INTENTIONALLY AWAITING FOR COURT PROCEEDINGS TO POSSIBLY OCCUR PRIOR TO HIM RESPONDING. FINALLY, THERE ARE SEVERAL ADDITIONAL HYPOTHESES AS TO WHY MR. ENLERS WOULD HAVE NOT ADHERED TO HIS PROFESSIONAL OBLIGATION, ESPECIALLY CONSIDERING THE FACT THAT YOU WOULD HAVE THOUGHT MR. ENLERS WOULD HAVE RESPONDED IN A TIMELY MANNER OWING TO THE SERIOUSNESS AND THE IMPORTANCE OF THE FILED COMPLAINTS.

ONCE AGAIN, I WANT TO NOTE THAT THERE IS SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE TO SUGGEST THAT THERE WAS A CONFLICT OF INTEREST(S) AS IT IS RELATED TO MR. DEREK WIDDICKS OF SIMCOE C.A.S. FOR THE LAW SOCIETY TO DISMISS, TO DISCOUNT, TO IGNORE AND NOT ADDRESS THIS ISSUE TO THE FULLEST EXTENT IS ONLY TO BE NEGLIGENT. PLEASE RE-OPEN AND RE-ADDRESS THIS CONFLICT OF INTEREST(S). UNFORTUNATELY, YOU FAILED TO RESPOND TO THIS REQUEST IN YOUR LETTER DATED THE 01-AUG-12.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONTINUED COOPERATION AND YOUR ATTENTION TO MY REQUESTS.

YOURS TRULY,



DEREK DUNLOP
CENTRAL NORTH CORRECTIONAL CENTRE - RANGE 1-C
1501 FULLER AVENUE
PENETANGUISHENE, ONTARIO
L9M 2M4



The Law Society of Upper Canada | Barreau du Haut-Canada

Osgoode Hall
130 Queen Street West
Toronto, Ontario
M5H 2N6

Tel: (416)947-5215
Fax: (416)947-5256

Complaints Resolution Department
Professional Regulation

Chandi Syed
Complaints Resolution Counsel

csyed@lsuc.on.ca

August 22, 2012

Private & Confidential

Derek Dunlop
Central North Correctional Centre, Range 1-C
1501 Fuller Avenue
Penetanguishene, Ontario L9M 2N4

Dear Mr. Dunlop:

Re: Lawyer: Eginhart Ehlers
Complainant: Derek Dunlop
Case No. 2012-106759

I am enclosing a copy of the Lawyer's letter to the Law Society dated August 17, 2012. If you want to comment on the letter from the Lawyer, please send me your written comments by **September 12, 2012**. If I do not receive written comments by that date, I will place this complaint file in queue to complete the review of the regulatory issues based on the material and information now in the file. If you need more time, please contact me before the deadline and tell me when I can expect your response. You may also contact me to discuss the matter.

YOU DID NOT ACT ASK
MEMBER
I AM WRITING
TO BE
WITH
MIL
HARLES
AS NEW
AND
INVESTIGATION
IN YOUR
LETTER
DATE
M.B. AT THE
DOUBLE
SYDNEY
M.B. CASE

In addition, I have received your letter dated August 9, 2012. When you provided your case notes with your letter dated June 19, 2012, you did not indicate that you did not want these materials to be shared with the Lawyer. As such, these materials were shared with the Lawyer as part of a full, fair, and transparent investigation of professional misconduct.

Furthermore, I responded to your concerns regarding the issue of conflict of interest in my letter dated July 4, 2012. Pursuant to the *Law Society Act*, the Law Society does not have statutory jurisdiction to investigate every issue or allegation raised by a complainant. For an investigation to be conducted pursuant to section 49.3 (2) of the *Law Society Act*, there must be evidence raising reasonable suspicion that the lawyer may have engaged in professional conduct. An investigation was not instructed on the allegation of conflict of interest as the evidence you provided did not satisfy the legislative threshold of reasonable suspicion.

Yours very truly,

Chandi Syed
Complaints Resolution Counsel

CS/ng

Enclosure:

- 1. Letter from the Lawyer —6 pages

EHLERS LEGAL
PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

THE SIMPSON TOWER
401 BAY STREET
SUITE 1600
TORONTO, ONTARIO
M5H 2Y4

24 HR: TOLL FREE 1-888-456-4110
TELEPHONE: 416-646-6776
FAX: 416-646-6777

August 17, 2012

Chandi Syed
Complaints Review Counsel
The Law Society of Upper Canada
Complaints Resolution Department
Osgoode Hall
130 Queen Street West
Toronto, ON
M5H 2N6

Dear Counsel:

Re: Complaint of Derek Dunlop
Our file - 0982
LSUC Case No. 2012-106759

Thank you for your notice letter dated June 7, 2012, your follow up letter dated July 4, 2012 as well as your final letter dated August 1, 2012.

The complaint

As I understand it, your investigation relates to allegations made by one Derek Dunlop, who has complained that during the time in which I represented him, I failed to inform him of the "crown's position" following a crown resolution meeting, misled him or failed to inform him of the of length and/or terms of sentence which the crown was seeking on a plea, failed to show him the disclosure related to his case, and that I failed to respond to his letter of March 2, 2012.

I respond by way of a denial of the allegations against me and point out that my representation of Mr. Dunlop falls well within the expected quality of service provided to clients who retain counsel for a defence in criminal matters.

It is my view in fact, that subject to factors beyond counsel's control, Mr. Dunlop received legal services which exceeded the average standard provided to clients in his position. Mr. Dunlop is not a stranger to the criminal justice system in Canada. On several occasions I explained to him that counsel must follow required protocol which includes but is not limited to bail hearings, court appearances, crown resolution meetings, judicial pre-trial meetings, set date court, applications by crown and/or defence and finally a trial and sentencing hearing if required. Mr. Dunlop's case, given his initial indecisive approach to retaining counsel, his lack of clear

While I have a good recollection of my pre-retainer discussions, it is not my practice to create or retain written notes on general, non case specific advice. Once retained, it is my practice to re-review the solicitor – client terms of retainer. I attach a copy of my firm internal memo dated February 16, 2012 (vetted to exclude other client information).

On February 29, 2012 I was advised by way of internal office memo that Mr. Dunlop had contacted my office to advise that his matter was going to be spoken to in #9 court Barrie, by way of video on March 2, 2012. I append a copy of the memo, dated February 29, 2012 (vetted to exclude other client information)

On March 2, 2012 I spoke with Mr. Dunlop by way of video court telephone prior to his appearance. At that time he advised me that he wished to retain my services and I discussed his case with him from 08:45 until 09:00 at which time court opened and my discussion with him was terminated. Other than my speaking to this matter on the record, I did not engage in discussions with crown counsel. Given that crown counsel was on their feet from 09:00 on, I was not provided with a crown resolution position on that day and therefore did not relay such information to Mr. Dunlop. During my discussion with this gentleman on March 2, 2012, as evidenced by my notes, I advised him that:

WMA
ALLES
MISCALE
BY PBA/LE

- In light of the retainer, I was now going to go on the record as counsel of record;
- I needed to fully review the disclosure prior to being in a position to advise him;
- I would set up a resolution meeting with crown counsel at my earliest convenience, but the date of the resolution meeting was subject to the resolution crown schedule as well as my schedule;
- I had no knowledge of the crown resolution position as I had not been retained before today and had therefore not had discussions with crown counsel related to the substance of this matter;
- I would not be in a position to meet with a resolution crown on that day as such meeting was by appointment only;
- In light of the information which he had provided in the fifteen(15) minute discussion, his defence was likely limited to testing the crown case at trial as the client's admissions to me precluded me from allowing him to deny the charge if he testified in his own defence;
- He was advised that he should give serious thought to the possibility of resolution if the crown position was a fair one.

(I enclose a copy of my notes related to this matter for March 2, 2012)

While speaking to the matter on the record on March 2, 2012, I confirmed the formal retainer by Mr. Dunlop and asked that I be noted as counsel of record. The matter was remanded to March 7, 2012 by way of video appearance. This video remand was at the client's request as we did not know whether the resolution crown and I would both be available prior to the next appearance and that in any event, I would not be able to stay beyond the brief appearance to speak to the matter on March 7, 2012, as I had a number of other matters in the Midland courthouse that day. Mr. Dunlop understood this and provided me with instructions for this remand request.

THIS IS ANOTHER COURT

MARCH 2012

Prior to my discussion with the client for the March 7, 2012 video appearance, I completed a review of the available disclosure. As a result of this review and subsequent discussion with Mr. Dunlop by video court telephone, I advised him that his case for trial was limited to testing the

CLB

Even if he did review the disclosure with me what do

On March 7th, 2012 - Mr. Ehlens does not make any reference
to what I have testified about the 70 days of custody time
Mr. Ehlens' opinion and response to disclosure is also admission of some
sort of guilt.

-4-

crown evidence as the constituent elements of the offence had been confirmed by him as he admitted having sent a package containing letters and emails of some sort, to his ex-girlfriend in contravention of repeated past warnings from police and staff of his former employer, not to do so. In reviewing the content of the crown disclosure with him, it was made clear to Mr. Dunlop that his criminal intent and physical actions leading to the charge of criminal harassment, would likely be proven at trial beyond a reasonable doubt. Mr. Dunlop had made a statement to police which confirmed his actions. In answer to my question as to why he had done so, he advised that he did not believe that "no contact meant forever" and that he had thought "she was better than that". I advised him that the facts as he had explained them to me, limited his options at trial and that conviction was likely.

I advised him to give the possibility of a resolution by way of an early plea strong consideration. Given the facts and law related to this matter, as well as the short time period from retainer to review of the initial disclosure and thus my inability to hold meaningful discussions with a resolution crown, on my advice, Mr. Dunlop instructed me to remand the matter to plea court as this would force the crown to take a sentencing position for an early plea. The matter was remanded to plea court in Barric, for March 12, 2012, with Mr. Dunlop appearing in person on that day. I note that the time from retainer to plea court was only ten (10) days.

On March 12, 2012, a crown resolution meeting was set for March 16, 2012, at 14:30 (2:30pm). It is standard practice to hold crown resolution meeting by telephone. Normal protocol is for defence counsel to wait for a telephone call from crown counsel on the day and time scheduled.

On March 16, 2012, I did not receive a telephone call from Mr. Kevin Sisk, who was the scheduled resolution crown on that day. On speaking to the crown's secretary at around 15:00 (3:00pm) that day, I was advised that Mr. Sisk was not available at that time but would call me when he was available. I did not receive a call and thus, a resolution meeting did not take place as originally scheduled. As the resolution meeting did not take place, no notes to file were added. I note that it not uncommon for resolution meetings to be re-scheduled for a future date.

On the next scheduled appearance date, March 19, 2012, I attended the plea court early in order to obtain a crown resolution position. The plea court that day was staffed by the Simcoe County Deputy Crown Attorney, Ms. Lynn Saunders. Once she had reviewed Mr. Dunlop's file she advised me as follows:

- The crown was not willing to take a final position as to sentence on a plea as it had been determined that given the facts of this case, the crown would be seeking a mental health assessment on Mr. Dunlop;
- The length of the mental health assessment being sought was for a period of 30 days;
- In the event that Mr. Dunlop would not consent to such assessment, and an Order for an assessment were to be denied by the Court, then the crown would be seeking a sentence of nine (9) months custody on a plea.

Having obtained the crown's plea/sentencing position, I attended the cells and had a meeting with Mr. Dunlop. I explained the crown's position to him and we discussed the issue of a mental health assessment. Mr. Dunlop immediately rejected any form of mental health assessment and advised that he would "rather do more time" than participate in such an assessment. We then

discussed the next procedural step of conducting a Judicial Pre-trial and Mr. Dunlop instructed me to set a date for a Judicial Pre-trial. The matter was traversed from plea court (court room #8) to the set date court (court room #9), in which a Judicial Pre-trial date was set for April 30, 2012. This date was the first date offered on which I was available. Mr. Dunlop was in the respective court rooms, knew which date had been set for the judicial pre-trial and did not object to the setting of this date. I attach my note to file for this date.

Correspondence from the client

I acknowledge that Mr. Dunlop sent me a letter dated March 2, 2012, the content of which speaks for itself. This letter was referred to briefly during my subsequent conversations with him but the content was not relevant to the factual or legal issues for which I had been retained.

During my discussions with Mr. Dunlop, the crown disclosure was reviewed in some detail as this was the evidence on which the crown was going to be relying in prosecuting the case. It was clearly explained to Mr. Dunlop at that time that the legal issue involved the case law and a determination of what the courts have found to be the definition of criminal harassment, as well as the factual issues which had been largely pre-determined when Mr. Dunlop neglected to exercise his right to remain silent. The only truly triable issue was limited to whether the crown could meet its onus of proof beyond a reasonable doubt. I advised Mr. Dunlop that subject to my responsibility as an officer of the court, I was willing to assist him at trial despite the fact that in my estimation the crown would likely succeed.

I further acknowledge receipt of a letter from Mr. Dunlop dated March 22, 2012. I discussed the content of that letter with him on the Judicial Pre-trial date of April 30, 2012 at which time he dismissed me and I brought an Application before Justice Harpur, the scheduled Judicial Pre-trial judge, to be removed as counsel of record for Derek Dunlop. The Application was granted and the client's crown disclosure was returned to Ms. Saunders who, once again, was representing the crown on that day.

Bail

In light of Mr. Dunlop's inability to produce a surety as well as the crown's unwillingness to offer a consent release for bail, bail was adjourned to allow for resolution discussions and the possibility that a surety might be located. No bail hearing was conducted during the time in which I acted for Mr. Dunlop.

Conclusion

In response to the allegations made by Derek Dunlop I note as follows:

- I was retained by way of Ontario Legal Aid certificate #CE55256428, which certificate was accepted by my office on February 23, 2012;
- During the term of the retainer from March 2, 2012 until April 30, 2012, my client was at all times properly represented within the normal parameters of the criminal legal process;

- At all times throughout the period of the retainer, my client was verbally advised of the process, consulted on the progress of his matter and had the strengths and weaknesses of the allegations made by the crown explained to him;
- Correspondence from the client was verbally reviewed with him, but not responded to in writing as:
 1. it was largely irrelevant to the case, and;
 2. any written response would have been potentially subject to perusal by other persons at the jail facility, which could have endangered him. For this reason it is not my practice to provide copies of disclosure or written correspondence, which relates to my client's interests, to incarcerated clients. This policy was explained to him;
- At no time did I mislead my client or advise him of progress related to his case which was inaccurate, irrelevant or untrue.

*LEGAL
RECORDS
ARE
CONFIDENTIAL*

*mislead
no answer*


*with
with*

*with
with*

I trust my response to your inquiry satisfies my professional obligation to the Law Society of Upper Canada. Should you require elucidation or additional information I would be pleased to hear from you.

REST OF THE

Yours truly,



Eginhart L. Ehlers
Counsel

ELE/md

10-SEP-12

CHANDI SYED, COMPLAINTS RESOLUTION COUNSEL

THE LAW SOCIETY OF UPPER CANADA

130 QUEEN STREET WEST

TORONTO, ONTARIO M5H 2N6

RE : LAWYER : EGINHART EHLERS

COMPLAINANT : DEREK DUNLOP

CASE NO : 2012-106759

DEAR MS. SYED :

I AM WRITING IN RESPONSE TO THE LETTER THAT I RECEIVED FROM YOU DATED THE 22-AUG-12 WITH THE ACCOMPANYING 6 PAGE LETTER OF MR. EGINHART EHLERS DATED THE 17-AUG-12. FIRST, I WANT TO THANK YOU FOR YOUR PATIENCE, CONTINUED COOPERATION AND ASSISTANCE IN THIS HIGHLY CONTENTIOUS MATTER. NEXT, I WANT TO UNEQUIVOCALLY NOTIFY YOU THAT THE CONTENTS OF MR. EHLERS' AFOREMENTIONED CORRESPONDENCE IS LITTERED AND COMPRISED OF A SIGNIFICANT NUMBER OF FRAUDULENT LIES, MISREPRESENTATIONS, DECEPTIONS, FALSIFICATIONS, DENIALS AND FABRICATIONS. ONCE AGAIN, PLEASE LET ME RE-ITERATE FOR THE RECORD THAT I HAVE ABSOLUTELY AND ENTIRELY NO REASON TO LIE OR TO BE UNTRUTHFUL ABOUT THE IMPROPRIETIES, WRONGDOINGS AND TRANSGRESSIONS THAT MR. EHLERS DID INITIALLY COMMIT THROUGHOUT THE DURATION OF MR. EHLERS LEGAL REPRESENTATION OF MYSELF IN ACCORDANCE TO MY MATTER BEFORE THE HONOURABLE COURT. MOREOVER, I WILL FURTHER STATE THAT IT IS APPALLING THAT MR. EHLERS HAS HAD THE AUDACITY AND GALL TO MISTREAT ME DURING THE COURSE OF HIS REPRESENTATION OF ME. MORE SPECIFICALLY, MR. EHLERS WOULD BE WELL AWARE AND COGNIZANT OF THE FACTS THAT THERE IS A PREPONDERANCE OF EVIDENCE EXISTING AGAINST MR. EHLERS AS IT RELATES TO MY COMPLAINTS, ISSUES AND CONCERNS. INSTEAD OF MR. EHLERS POSSESSING THE COURAGE TO ADMIT THAT HE WAS IN THE WRONG ON NUMEROUS OCCASIONS IN THE FIRST PLACE, MR. EHLERS HAS NOW TAKEN IT UPON HIMSELF TO ENGAGE IN A COLOSSAL AMOUNT OF

COVER-UPS IN ORDER TO TRY TO OBSCURE, DISTORT, CONCEAL, MANIPULATE AND HIDE THE TRUTH. AS A RESULT, MR. EHLERS HAS NOW PURPOSELY COMMITTED ADDITIONAL ILLEGAL ACTIONS, MISCONDUCT, LIES AND DENIALS TO COVER-UP FOR THE INITIAL WRONGDOINGS THAT MR. EHLERS CARRIED OUT. ADDITIONALLY, I WILL STATE MR. EHLERS HAS MADE DEROGATORY COMMENTS AND CONDESCENDING REMARKS WHICH ARE TRULY UNWARRANTED, UNNECESSARY, UNDESIRABLE, INEXPLICABLE, CALLOUS AND MAUCIOUS IN THEIR MERIT. THESE WORD STATEMENTS ARE PRIMARILY REFERENCED IN MR. EHLERS' LETTER ON PAGE #1, PARAGRAPH #A THAT IS ALSO CARRIED OVER ONTO PAGE #2. MOREOVER, MR. EHLERS PERSISTS WITH SUCH CARELESS COMMENTS SPORADICALLY THROUGHOUT HIS 6 PAGES OF CORRESPONDENCE.

I AM NOT GOING TO RESORT TO PERSONALLY ATTACKING MR. EHLERS' PERSONALITY BUT I WILL SAY THAT AS MR. EHLERS CONTINUES TO ENGAGE HIMSELF IN THESE OUTRIGHT LIES, OUTRIGHT FALSIFICATIONS AND OUTRIGHT FABRICATIONS THAT MR. EHLERS IS EMBARRASSING YOUR ORGANIZATION AS WELL AS HE IS EMBARRASSING HIMSELF. OBVIOUSLY, THERE WOULD BE AN ENORMOUSLY HIGH PROPENSITY FOR MR. EHLERS TO COVER-UP, LIE AND DENY ABOUT WHAT HE HAS ALREADY DONE TO ME. MR. EHLERS REALIZES THAT HE COULD SUFFER A SUBSTANTIAL AMOUNT OF SERIOUS REPERCUSSIONS, RAMIFICATIONS AND CONSEQUENCES IF MR. EHLERS DID ADMIT TO ANY AND/OR ALL OF HIS MISCONDUCT. UNFORTUNATELY, I DO NOT POSSESS THE FACTUAL EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT THIS NEXT STATEMENT BUT, I CAN VIRTUALLY GUARANTEE YOU THAT MR. EHLERS BELIEVED THAT HIS INITIAL MISCONDUCT, MALTREATMENT, ILLEGAL ACTIONS AND IMPROPRIETIES AGAINST ME WOULD NEVER BE CHALLENGED, EXPLOITED AND/OR EXPOSED AND THAT MR. EHLERS FIGURED THAT HE WOULD BE ABLE TO GET AWAY WITH HIS INEXCUSABLE, DESPICABLE AND REPREHENSIBLE CONDUCT COMMITTED AGAINST MYSELF. IT IS ASTOUNDING THAT MR. EHLERS MUST HAVE FELT AN ENTITLEMENT TO MISTREAT ME IN ANY MANNER THAT HE WANTED TO WITHOUT ANY FEAR OF SUFFERING THE POSSIBLE PUNISHMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH HIS BEHAVIORS. MR. EHLERS IS A PROFESSIONAL PROMINENT PERSON WHO OCCUPIES A POSITION OF POWER, TRUST AND AUTHORITY. THERE IS A CODE OF ETHICS AND PROFESSIONAL DUTIES, RESPONSIBILITIES AND OBLIGATIONS THAT MR. EHLERS HAS VIOLATED AT VARIOUS TIMES DURING HIS COURSE OF PROVIDING LEGAL SERVICES TO ME AS A CLIENT. FURTHERMORE, LET IT BE KNOWN THAT MR. EHLERS TREATED ME IMPROPERLY, UNJUSTLY, INAPPROPRIATELY AND UNFAIRLY. MOREOVER,

IT IS UNDENIABLY TRUE THAT MR. EHLERS DID TREAT ME WITH DISCRIMINATIONS, WITH BIASES AND WITH NUMEROUS PREJUDICES. FROM MR. EHLERS' PERSPECTIVE HE HAD NO CHOICE BUT TO LIE ABOUT ALL OF HIS MALTREATMENT OF ME, OTHERWISE, MR. EHLERS WOULD BE SUBJECTING HIMSELF TO THE RISK OF RUINING, COMPROMISING AND JEOPARDIZING HIS PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION, INTEGRITY AND CREDIBILITY. IT IS NOW EVIDENT THAT MR. EHLERS HAS HAD TO RESORT TO SUCH DESPERATE MEASURES TO COVER-UP FOR HIS INITIAL TRANSGRESSIONS. I MUST ALSO NOTE THAT MR. EHLERS HAS FRAUDULENTLY MISREPRESENTED NUMEROUS EVENTS THAT HAVE TRANSPIRED DURING OUR CONTACTS WITH EACH OTHER. AT THIS POINT, I AM UNABLE TO PROPERLY IDENTIFY WHAT MR. EHLERS' EXACT MOTIVE(S) WOULD BE TO MISTREAT ME IN THE DISGRACEFUL AND PATHETIC FASHION IN WHICH HE HAS BUT, I WILL ASSERT AND ALMOST GUARANTEE YOU THAT IT WOULD HAVE SOME DIRECT AND INDIRECT ASSOCIATION AND IS RELATED TO THE ON-GOING COLLUSION, COVER-UPS AND CORRUPTION THAT I HAVE ENCOUNTERED THROUGHOUT THE PAST 6-7 YEARS IN CONDUCTION WITH THE CIVIL AND CRIMINAL COURTS IN THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO (ENCAPULATED IN THE 6 LETTERS SENT TO YOU BY MY MOTHER, MS. BARB DUNNIP WITH A COVER LETTER DATED THE 20-JUL-12).

NOW, I WILL ADDRESS THE SPECIFIED PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT ISSUES THAT MR. EHLERS REFERENCED IN HIS 6 PAGE LETTER. THE FOUR AREAS THAT MR. EHLERS HAS IDENTIFIED ARE THE FOLLOWING: ① MR. EHLERS FAILED TO SHOW ME THE DISCLOSURE RELATED TO MY CASE; ② MR. EHLERS FAILED TO RESPOND TO MY LETTER DATED 02-MAR-12; ③ MR. EHLERS MISLED ME AND/OR FAILED TO INFORM ME OF THE LENGTH AND/OR TERMS OF SENTENCE WHICH THE CROWN WAS SEEKING ON A PLEA; ④ MR. EHLERS FAILED TO INFORM ME OF THE "CROWN'S POSITION" FOLLOWING A CROWN RESOLUTION MEETING.

#1. MR. EHLERS FAILED TO SHOW ME THE DISCLOSURE RELATED TO MY CASE.

FIRST, MAKE NO MISTAKE ABOUT IT MR. EHLERS NEVER DID SHOW ME THE DISCLOSURE AS IT RELATES TO THIS MATTER. MR. EHLERS WOULD NOT COOPERATE AND HE WOULD NOT AGREE TO MEET WITH ME TO GO OVER THE DISCLOSURE WITH ME

AS I HAD RESPECTFULLY AND POLITELY REQUESTED ON NUMEROUS OCCASIONS. MR. EHLERS HAS OUBRIGHT DENIED MY COMPLAINT THAT HE FAILED TO SHOW ME THE DISCLOSURE IN RELATION TO MY CASE. NEXT, LET ME POINT OUT THAT NOWHERE IN THE CONTENTS OF MR. EHLERS' 6 PAGE LETTER DOES MR. EHLERS INDICATE THAT HE IN FACT ACTUALLY PERMITTED ME TO VIEW, ASSESS, PERUSE, REVIEW AND/OR WITNESS THE REFERENCED DISCLOSURE. SO WITHOUT EVEN TECHNICALLY ADMITTING TO THE FACT THAT MR. EHLERS DID NOT SHOW ME THE DISCLOSURE, MR. EHLERS HAS UNINTENTIONALLY AND INADVERTENTLY INCRIMINATED HIMSELF BY NOT IDENTIFYING ANYWHERE IN HIS DOCUMENTATION THAT HE SHOWED ME THE DISCLOSURE. ON PAGE #3, PARAGRAPH #5 OF MR. EHLERS LETTER HE STATED THAT HE REVIEWED THE AVAILABLE DISCLOSURE WITH ME BY VIDEO-COURT TELEPHONE ON THE 07-MAR-12. ONCE AGAIN, MR. EHLERS DOES NOT ADMIT TO SHOWING ME THE DISCLOSURE. MOREOVER, LET ME STATE THAT THIS VIDEO-COURT TELEPHONE CONVERSATION ON THE 07-MAR-12 BETWEEN MR. EHLERS AND MYSELF WOULD HAVE BEEN NO MORE THAN 5 MINUTES IN DURATION AND ANY OF MR. EHLERS' ASSESSMENT AND REVIEW OF WHATEVER DISCLOSURE MR. EHLERS HAD IN HIS POSSESSION WAS EXTREMELY MINUTE IN DETAIL. ON THE 07-MAR-12 BY WAY OF VIDEO-COURT TELEPHONE MR. EHLERS DID NOTIFY ME OF HIS PRELIMINARY REVIEW OF THE NOTED DISCLOSURE ACCOMPANIED BY HIS FIRST LEGAL IMPRESSIONS OF SAID DISCLOSURE. ON THE OTHER HAND, FOR MR. EHLERS TO EVEN SUGGEST AND TO IMPLY THAT HE IN FACT CONDUCTED A REVIEW OF THE AVAILABLE DISCLOSURE WITH ME IS ABSOLUTELY ABSURD. WHILE MR. EHLERS WOULD HAVE REFERENCED CERTAIN SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF THE DISCLOSURE, THE PARTS OF THE DISCLOSURE THAT HE DID MENTION WERE VERY FEW IN NUMBERS. THIS ABOVE NOTED DISCUSSION WAS VERY SHORT IN LENGTH AND BASICALLY TO THE POINT, FOR MR. EHLERS TO REPRESENT THAT HE REVIEWED THE DISCLOSURE IN THAT BRIEF PERIOD OF TIME IS NOT FEASIBLE, NOT LOGISTICAL, NOT PRACTICAL AND NOT CONCEIVABLE.

MR. EHLERS IS MISLEADING YOUR ORGANIZATION BY DENYING MY COMPLAINT THAT MR. EHLERS DID NOT SHOW ME THE DISCLOSURE AS HE HAS DENIED IN HIS STATEMENT ON PAGE #1, PARAGRAPH #3 OF HIS 6 PAGE LETTER. UPON MR. EHLERS UNNOTICED ADMISSION MR. EHLERS HIMSELF NEVER IDENTIFIES WHEN, WHERE AND FOR HOW LONG HE APPARENTLY LET ME ASSESS THE DISCLOSURE. IF IN FACT MR. EHLERS DID ACTUALLY ALLOW ME TO REVIEW

THE DISCLOSURE THAN MR. EHLERS WOULD HAVE PROVIDED YOUR AGENCY WITH THE PLACE, THE DATE AND TIME AND THE TIME FRAME WHEN MY REVIEW OF THE DISCLOSURE WOULD HAVE TRANSPIRED. THE REASON(S) THAT MR. EHLERS DOES NOT MAKE ANY REFERENCE WHATSOEVER TO SHOWING ME THE AFOREMENTIONED DISCLOSURE IS THE SIMPLE FACT THAT MR. EHLERS IS GUILTY OF NOT SHOWING ME THE DISCLOSURE. LET ME FURTHER RE-ITERATE THAT MR. EHLERS IS NOW INTENTIONALLY COVERING UP FOR HIS INITIAL INDISCRETIONS, WRONGDOINGS AND IMPROPRIETIES, WHICH HE IS NOW ALSO GUILTY OF THESE INTOLERABLE ACTIONS. AT THIS POINT, THE ONLY OPTION FOR MR. EHLERS IS TO COMMIT ANOTHER COVER-UP BY FABRICATING ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ABOUT WHEN HE WAS SUPPOSED TO HAVE SHOWN ME THE DISCLOSURE. THE BOTTOM LINE AND THE TRUTH IS IS THAT MR. EHLERS NEVER SHOWED ME THE DISCLOSURE BUT ACCORDING TO MR. EHLERS HE DID SHOW ME THE DISCLOSURE AND MR. EHLERS HAS LIED ABOUT THIS TO YOU.

2. MR. EHLERS FAILED TO RESPOND TO MY LETTER DATED THE 02-MAR-12.

FIRST, MAKE NO MISTAKE ABOUT IT, MR. EHLERS NEVER DID RESPOND TO MY LETTER, DATED THE 02-MAR-12 IN ANY VERBAL AND/OR IN ANY WRITTEN FORM, OTHER THAN MR. EHLERS PROVIDING VERBAL ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO ME THAT HE DID INDEED RECEIVE SAID LETTER. AT NO TIME WERE ANY OF THE CONTENTS OF MY LETTER DATED THE 02-MAR-12 DISCUSSED AND/OR REVIEWED BETWEEN MR. EHLERS AND MYSELF AS MR. EHLER HAS IMPLIED. IN ADDITION, MR. EHLERS IS ATTEMPTING TO COVER-UP FOR HIMSELF BY SUGGESTING THAT THE LETTER WAS REFERRED TO BRIEFLY DURING OUR SUBSEQUENT CONVERSATIONS. MR. EHLERS IS LYING AGAIN. MR. EHLERS DOES NOT PROVIDE ANY SPECIFICS AND/OR ANY CONTEXT ABOUT WHAT APPARENTLY MR. EHLERS AND I DISCUSSED AS IT RELATES TO THE CONTENTS OF MY LETTER ADDRESSED TO HIM, DATED THE 02-MAR-12. YOU WILL NOTICE THAT MR. EHLERS WAS QUICK TO DISMISS AND MINIMIZE THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ABOVE MENTIONED LETTER BY STATING THAT IT WAS IRRELEVANT TO MY CASE. IT IS TOTALLY IRONIC THAT THE FIRST TIME I DISCOVERED THAT MR. EHLERS BELIEVED THAT THIS LETTER WAS IRRELEVANT TO MY MATTER IS UPON READING MR. EHLERS 6 PAGE LETTER, SENT TO ME BY THE LAW SOCIETY OF UPPER CANADA ON THE 22-AUG-12. MR. EHLERS NEVER SAID THIS TO ME.

FURTHERMORE, I AM DUMBFOUNDED AND BEWILDERED TO HEAR THAT MR. EHLERS BELIEVES THAT THIS DOCUMENT DATED 02-MAR-12 IS ENTIRELY INSIGNIFICANT TO MY MATTER. THIS JUST FURTHER CONTRIBUTES TO THE LACK OF CONCERN, THE DISREGARD AND THE LACK OF DEVOTION THAT MR. EHLERS POSSESSED TOWARDS MY CASE AND TOWARDS MYSELF. IN ADDITION, MR. EHLERS ASSERTS THAT ANY WRITTEN RESPONSE WOULD HAVE BEEN SUBJECT TO PERUSAL BY OTHER PERSONS AT THE JAIL FACILITY. I DO NOT KNOW FOR A FACT THAT MR. EHLERS WOULD KNOW THIS OR NOT BUT, ALL LEGAL CORRESPONDENCE THAT IS DELIVERED TO THE JAIL IS CONFIDENTIAL TO EACH RESPECTIVE INMATE. IT WOULD BE INTERESTING TO DETERMINE WHETHER OTHER CLIENTS OF MR. EHLERS HAVE RECEIVED LEGAL DOCUMENTATION AT THE JAIL FROM MR. EHLERS IN RELATION TO THEIR CASES. MOREOVER, MR. EHLERS STATED THAT THIS POLICY WAS EXPLAINED TO ME. THIS FACT IS ALSO ENTIRELY FALSE AS MR. EHLERS NEVER EXPLAINED THIS POLICY TO ME. ADDITIONALLY, MR. EHLERS NEVER INDICATED TO ME THAT ANY SUCH POLICY EVEN EXISTED OR WAS A STANDARD PRACTICE OF HIS.

3. MR. EHLERS MISLED ME AND/OR FAILED TO INFORM ME OF THE LENGTH AND/OR TERMS OF SENTENCE WHICH THE CROWN WAS SEEKING ON A PLEA.

FIRST, MAKE NO MISTAKE ABOUT IT MR. EHLERS MISLED ME ABOUT THE LENGTH AND THE TERMS OF SENTENCE WHICH THE CROWN WAS SEEKING ON A PLEA. MR. EHLERS INFORMED ME ABOUT THE CROWN'S POSITION ON 07-MAR-12 WHEN MR. EHLERS NOTIFIED ME BY WAY OF VIDEO-COURT TELEPHONE THAT THE CROWN ATTORNEY WANTED 30 DAYS OF IN CUSTODY TIME IF I ENTERED A PLEA AND MR. EHLERS BELIEVED THAT HE HAD RECEIVED THIS INFORMATION FROM MR. GARY EADIE. ON THE 07-MAR-12 MR. EHLERS STATED TO ME THAT HE COULD BRING ME TO PLEA COURT IN BARRIE, ONTARIO ON MONDAY MARCH 12, 2012 AND IF I DECIDED TO ENTER A PLEA THAT I WOULD PROBABLY BE RELEASED ON TIME SERVED FROM THE COURT ON THE 12-MAR-12. IT MUST BE NOTED THAT AT NO POINT THROUGHOUT THE ENTIRE CONTENTS OF MR. EHLERS 6 PAGE LETTER DOES MR. EHLERS REFERENCE THE 30 DAYS OF IN CUSTODY TIME THAT HE HAD INFORMED ME ABOUT ON THE 07-MAR-12. MR. EHLERS IS NEGLIGENT AS IT

RELATES TO THE CONVERSATION BETWEEN MR. EHLERS AND MYSELF ON THE 07-MAR-12 BECAUSE HE IS ATTEMPTING TO PRETEND THAT THAT ASPECT OF THE DISCUSSION NEVER HAPPENED. I CONTEMPORANEOUSLY DOCUMENTED MY NOTATIONS ABOUT SAID DISCUSSION ON THE 07-MAR-12 THAT MR. EHLERS AND I HAD. MY AFOREMENTIONED NOTES TRULY DEPICT AND TRULY REFLECT WHAT WAS CONVERSED. IT IS EVIDENT THAT MR. EHLERS MISLED ME IN THIS REGARD AND NOW MR. EHLERS IS COVERING UP FOR HIS INITIAL WRONGDOINGS BY MISLEADING THE LAW SOCIETY OF UPPER CANADA AND YOURSELF.

PLEASE LET ME ALSO NOTE THAT I INSTRUCTED MR. EHLERS TO SET THIS MATTER FOR TRIAL ON 2 SEPARATE OCCASSIONS. ONCE AGAIN, MR. EHLERS FAILS TO MENTION THESE FACTS ANYWHERE IN THE BODY OF HIS 6 PAGE LETTER. I WILL ALLUDE TO THIS FURTHER, LATER ON IN THIS LETTER. NEXT, I NEVER INSTRUCTED MR. EHLERS TO REMAND THE MATTER TO PLEA COURT AS THIS WOULD FORCE THE CROWN TO TAKE A SENTENCING POSITION FOR AN EARLY PLEA AS MR. EHLERS HAS SUGGESTED THAT I DID. FIRST, I NEVER KNEW THAT THE CROWN WOULD BE FORCED INTO TAKING A SENTENCE POSITION AS MR. EHLERS IS ATTEMPTING TO IMPLY THAT I DID. SECOND, MY LETTER DATED THE 22-MAR-12 WILL REFLECT AND OUTLINE ON PAGE #2, PARAGRAPH #1 THAT I WAS UNSURE WHY MR. EHLERS ADVISED AND SUGGESTED TO KEEP MY MATTER IN PLEA COURT. IN ADDITION, I SUGGESTED THAT MY MATTER REMAINING BEFORE THE PLEA COURT WOULD NOT BE ADVANTAGEOUS TO ME. ONCE AGAIN, I POSSESS CONTEMPORANEOUSLY DOCUMENTED NOTES IN ACCORDANCE TO THE CONVERSATION BETWEEN MR. EHLERS AND MYSELF. FOR MR. EHLERS TO REFUTE AND DIRECTLY CONTRADICT MY NOTATIONS BY STATING THAT I INSTRUCTED HIM TO REMAND MY MATTER TO PLEA COURT IS ABSOLUTELY AND ENTIRELY PROPOSTEROUS AND ASSININE. MR. EHLERS IS DEFINITELY COVERING UP FOR HIMSELF HERE BUT, MR. EHLERS WOULD ALSO HAVE THE INTERESTS OF THE CROWN ATTORNEY IN MIND KNOWING FULL WELL THAT THE CROWN ATTORNEY COULD BE IMPLICATED AND INCRIMINATED SHOULD IT BE REVEALED THAT MR. EHLERS ACTUALLY COMMITTED THE MISCONDUCT AGAINST ME THAT MR. EHLERS HAS CARRIED OUT. ON THE 12-MAR-12 I MET WITH MR. EHLERS IN THE HOLDING CELLS AT THE BARRIE COURTHOUSE AND MR. EHLERS INFORMED ME THAT HE HAD RECEIVED MY MESSAGE INSTRUCTING HIM TO

SET MY MATTER FOR TRIAL. MR. EHLERS DOES NOT REFERENCE THIS FACT ANYWHERE THROUGHOUT THE CONTENTS OF HIS 6 PAGE LETTER. PLEASE NOTE THAT I WOULD HAVE CONTACTED MR. EHLERS' OFFICE BETWEEN MARCH 7TH 2012 - MARCH 9TH 2012 INSTRUCTING MR. EHLERS TO TAKE THIS CASE TO TRIAL. ON THE 12-MAR-12 MR. EHLERS CONVINCED ME TO PROCEED FORWARD WITH ANOTHER CROWN RESOLUTION MEETING AND ADVISED TO HAVE MY MATTER REMAIN BEFORE THE PLEA COURT. AGAIN, ON THE 13-MAR-12, I CONTACTED MR. EHLERS' OFFICE AND INFORMED A GENTLEMAN NAMED MARK TO INSTRUCT MR. EHLERS TO TAKE THIS MATTER TO TRIAL AND FOR MR. EHLERS TO PLEASE OBTAIN THE EARLIEST JUDICIAL PRE-TRIAL DATE AND THE EARLIEST TRIAL DATES AVAILABLE. ONCE AGAIN, MR. EHLERS FAILS TO ACKNOWLEDGE THESE ABOVE NOTED INSTRUCTIONS. THE BOTTOM LINE IS IS THAT MR. EHLERS MISLED ME ABOUT THE LENGTH AND TERMS OF SENTENCE WHICH THE CROWN WAS SEEKING ON A PLEA AND ALSO FAILED TO FOLLOW THE AFOREMENTIONED INSTRUCTIONS.

4. MR. EHLERS FAILED TO INFORM ME OF THE CROWN'S POSITION FOLLOWING A CROWN RESOLUTION MEETING.

FIRST, MAKE NO MISTAKE ABOUT IT, MR. EHLERS FAILED TO INFORM ME OF THE CROWN'S POSITION FOLLOWING A CROWN RESOLUTION MEETING PRIOR TO MY COURT PROCEEDINGS ON THE 19-MAR-12 AT THE BARRIE COURTHOUSE IN BARRIE, ONTARIO. AS I HAVE PREVIOUSLY INDICATED TO YOU ON PAGE #2, PARAGRAPH #2 OF MY COMPLAINT LETTER DATED THE 22-MAR-12, MR. EHLERS DID NOT NOTIFY ME OF ANY CROWN POSITION UNTIL I WAS IN THE PRISONER'S BOX INSIDE OF COURTROOM #9 AT THE BARRIE COURTHOUSE ON THE 19-MAR-12 THAT THE CROWN WAS SEEKING 9 MONTHS OF CUSTODY TIME AND A 30-DAY ASSESSMENT. FURTHERMORE, MR. EHLERS NOTIFIED ME FOR THE FIRST TIME WHILE IN THE PRISONER'S BOX THAT HE WAS GOING TO SET A JUDICIAL PRE-TRIAL FOR THE 30-APR-12 WITHOUT ASKING ME WHETHER I WANTED TO ACCEPT THE CROWN'S OFFER OR NOT. MR. EHLERS ALSO INFORMED ME THAT THE EARLIEST DATE HE HAD AVAILABLE FOR JUDICIAL PRE-TRIAL WAS THE 30-APR-12.

ON PAGE #4, PARAGRAPH #6 OF MR. EHLERS 6 PAGE LETTER, MR. EHLERS HAS FRAUDULENTLY MISREPRESENTED THAT AFTER HE APPARENTLY OBTAINED THE CROWN'S PLEA/SENTENCING

POSITION THAT HE ATTENDED THE CELLS AND HAD A MEETING WITH ME. THIS MEETING NEVER HAPPENED. AS I HAVE CONTEMPORANEOUSLY DOCUMENTED IN MY NOTES, MR. EHLERS BROUGHT ME UP INTO COURTROOM #9 AND INFORMED ME IN THE PRISONER'S BOX WHAT THE CROWN'S POSITION WAS WITHOUT ANY PRIOR NOTIFICATION AND WITHOUT ANY MEETING IN THE HOLDING CELLS AS MR. EHLERS HAS STATED.

MR. EHLERS STATED THAT AT THIS POINT WE THEN DISCUSSED THE NEXT PROCEDURAL STEP OF CONDUCTING A JUDICIAL PRE-TRIAL AND I INSTRUCTED HIM TO SET A DATE FOR A JPT. ONCE AGAIN, THIS IS A FABRICATED FICTITIOUS GENERATED OCCURRENCE BY MR. EHLERS IN ORDER TO COVER-UP FOR HIMSELF. ONCE AGAIN, THERE WAS NO CONVERSATION THAT TRANSPIRED BEFORE COURT IN THE HOLDING CELLS BETWEEN MR. EHLERS AND MYSELF. ADDITIONALLY, MR. EHLERS DID NOT STATE ANYTHING ABOUT A J.P.T. UNTIL I WAS IN THE PRISONER'S BOX ON THE 19-MAR-12 AT WHICH TIME MR. EHLERS SAID HE WAS GOING TO SET A DATE FOR JUDICIAL PRE-TRIAL FOR THE 30-APR-12. NEXT, MR. EHLERS STATED THAT THE MATTER WAS TRANSFERRED FROM COURTROOM #8 TO COURTROOM #9. UPON READING MR. EHLERS 6 PAGE LETTER IS THE FIRST TIME THAT I HAVE HEARD ABOUT THIS SO IF THERE WERE ANY COURT PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED IN COURTROOM #8 ON THE 19-MAR-12 THEY WERE CONDUCTED WITHOUT MY KNOWLEDGE AND WITHOUT MY PRESENCE. THE ONLY COURTROOM THAT I ATTENDED ON THE 19-MAR-12 WAS COURTROOM #9. I NEVER APPEARED IN COURTROOM #8 AT THE BARRIE COURTHOUSE, BARRIE, ONTARIO ON THE 19-MAR-12.

I MUST ALSO NOTE THAT THE FIRST TIME I HEARD ABOUT THE CROWN ATTORNEY NOT WILLING TO TAKE A FINAL POSITION AS TO SENTENCE ON A PLEA WAS UPON MY READING OF PAGE #4, PARAGRAPH #5 OF MR. EHLERS 6 PAGE LETTER. AT THIS POINT, I AM UNSURE EXACTLY WHAT THAT MEANS FROM A LEGAL STANDPOINT BUT, THAT IS ANOTHER ISSUE ENTIRELY.

AS FAR AS THE SCHEDULED CROWN RESOLUTION MEETING THAT WAS SUPPOSED TO OCCUR BETWEEN MR. EHLERS AND MR. SISK ON THE 16-MAR-12 THAT APPARENTLY DID NOT HAPPEN, I AM NOT GOING TO SAY THAT WHAT MR. EHLERS HAS INDICATED IS UNTRUE, HOWEVER, I WILL SPECULATE THAT IT IS RATHER ODD THAT THIS MEETING DID NOT TRANSPIRE. ONCE

AGAIN, THE FIRST TIME I BECAME AWARE THAT MR. EHLERS AND MR. SISK DID NOT HAVE THE SCHEDULED CROWN RESOLUTION MEETING ON THE 16-MAR-12 WAS UPON READING THE 6 PAGE LETTER OF MR. EHLERS. AS A RESULT, OF THE EXORBITANT AMOUNT OF MR. EHLERS OTHER LIES AND COVER-UPS, HIS STATEMENTS IN REGARD TO WHAT HAPPENED WITH THIS MEETING ARE HIGHLY SUSPICIOUS AND I WOULD NOT PUT IT PAST MR. EHLERS TO BE DECEITFUL ABOUT THE EVENTS SURROUNDING THIS MEETING. THE BOTTOM LINE IS IS THAT MR. EHLERS WAS EXTREMELY UNPROFESSIONAL, UNETHICAL AND TOTALLY IN THE WRONG BY FAILING TO INFORM ME ABOUT THE CROWN'S RESOLUTION POSITION PRIOR TO HAVING ME ATTEND COURTROOM #9 AND FAILING TO NOTIFY ME THAT HE WAS GOING TO SCHEDULE A JUDICIAL PRE-TRIAL UNTIL I WAS IN THE PRISONER'S BOX. AGAIN, MR. EHLERS IS COVERING UP.

MR. EHLERS' RETAINER

PRIOR TO THE 22-FEB-12, IT WAS CONFIRMED THAT MR. EHLERS WAS ABLE TO ATTEND AND HE WOULD BE IN ATTENDANCE AT COURT IN REZATION TO MY MATTER ON THE 29-FEB-12. ON THE 22-FEB-12, I SPOKE TO MR. GARY EADIE, LAWYER WHO WAS ASSISTING ME. ON THE 22-FEB-12 I NOTIFIED MR. EADIE THAT I HAD SPOKE TO MR. EHLERS AND THAT MR. EHLERS WAS AVAILABLE NEXT WEDNESDAY (BEING THE 29-FEB-12). MR. EADIE ASKED ME IF I WANTED TO MOVE MY MATTER TO NEXT WEDNESDAY AND I SAID SURE. MY MATTER WAS SCHEDULED FOR THE 29-FEB-12 WITH THE EXPECTATION AND CONFIRMATION FROM MR. EHLERS THAT HE WOULD BE IN ATTENDANCE IN COURT ON THE 29-FEB-12. ON THE 29-FEB-12 MR. EHLERS DID NOT APPEAR IN COURT TO REPRESENT ME. I HAD TO CONTACT MR. EHLERS' OFFICE AFTER MY SCHEDULED VIDEO-COURT APPEARANCE TO FIND OUT THAT MR. EHLERS WAS UNAVAILABLE TO ATTEND COURT. PLEASE NOTE THAT MR. EHLERS NEVER MAKES REFERENCE TO THIS FACT ANYWHERE IN HIS 6 PAGE LETTER. FURTHERMORE, IT IS UNBELIEVABLE THAT MR. EHLERS CONVEYS IN HIS 6 PAGE LETTER THAT HE WAS NOT RETAINED UNTIL 02-MAR-12. MORE IMPORTANTLY, I MUST NOTE THAT IN MR. EHLERS LETTER THAT HE WAS RETAINED BY WAY OF ONTARIO LEGAL AID CERTIFICATE #CE55258428, WHICH CERTIFICATE WAS ACCEPTED BY WAY OF MR. EHLERS' OFFICE ON THE 23-FEB-12. MORE SPECIFICALLY, LET ME POINT OUT THAT THE REASON MR. EHLERS WAS FORWARDED THE

ONTARIO LEGAL AID CERTIFICATE ON THE 23-FEB-12 WAS DUE TO THE FACT THAT MR. EHLERS WAS SUPPOSED TO REPRESENT ME IN COURT ON THE 29-FEB-12. THE BOTTOM LINE IS THAT MR. EHLERS FAILED TO ATTEND COURT ON THE 29-FEB-12 AS MY LEGAL REPRESENTATION AND MR. EHLERS HAS NEGLECTED TO ADDRESS THIS FACT IN HIS 6 PAGE LETTER. MOREOVER, MR. EHLERS STATES THAT HE WAS NOT RETAINED UNTIL 02-MAR-12 WHICH IS AN OUBRIGHT LIE.

MARCH 2ND 2012.

IN REFERENCE TO THE NOTATIONS THAT MR. EHLERS HAS PROVIDED IN HIS LETTER ON PAGE #3 OF HIS 6 PAGE LETTER IN CONNECTION WITH THE 02-MAR-12, MR. EHLERS HAS FALSIFIED INFORMATION TO MISREPRESENT WHAT ACTUALLY TRANSPIRED. FIRST, MAKE NO MISTAKE ABOUT IT, I NEVER SPOKE TO MR. EHLERS FROM 8:45AM UNTIL 9:00AM ON THE 02-MAR-12 BY WAY OF VIDEO-COURT TELEPHONE. I NEVER SPOKE TO MR. EHLERS FOR ANY 15 MINUTE PERIOD OF TIME DURING THE COURSE OF MR. EHLERS LEGAL REPRESENTATION OF ME. MORE SPECIFICALLY, IT IS NOT LOGISTICAL, IT IS NOT PRACTICAL AND IT DOES NOT MAKE SENSE FOR A CONVERSATION BY WAY OF VIDEO-COURT TELEPHONE TO LAST FOR 15 MINUTES. FROM MY EXPERIENCES THERE ARE USUALLY NUMEROUS INMATES THAT ARE PARIALED TO ATTEND VIDEO-COURT AT THE SAME TIME AND LAWYERS ARE AWARE OF THESE FACTS. THESE ATTORNEYS EXPEDIENTLY DEAL WITH THEIR RESPECTIVE CLIENT AS RAPIDLY AS POSSIBLE. WHILE I AM SURE IT MIGHT BE POSSIBLE FOR SOME BODY TO HAVE A 15 MINUTE CONVERSATION BETWEEN LAWYER AND INMATE IT WOULD BE EXTREMELY UNLIKELY AND HIGHLY IMPROBABLE. IN ADDITION, PLEASE LET ME NOTE THAT ANY 5 MINUTE DISCUSSION BETWEEN ANY ATTORNEY AND ANY INMATE WOULD BE LONG IN DURATION. MR. EHLERS AND MY VIDEO-COURT TELEPHONE CONVERSATION ON THE 02-MAR-12 WOULD HAVE BEEN NOWHERE NEAR 15 MINUTES IN LENGTH. MR. EHLERS HAS FABRICATED THESE NOTATIONS FOR HIS BENEFIT AND HIS ADVANTAGE. IF MR. EHLERS HAS ALSO PRE-CALCULATED AND PRE-ORGANIZED AN ALIBI FROM THE JAIL STAFF THIS WILL JUST FURTHER CONTRIBUTE TO THE ON-GOING COVER-UPS. IF MR. EHLERS HAS FAULSLY MISREPRESENTED HIS TIME DOCUMENTS TO REFLECT THAT HE SPENT 15 MINUTES WITH ME ON THE VIDEO-COURT TELEPHONE IS ABSOLUTELY AN EMBARRASSED LIE. THERE ARE MANY OTHER, INACCURACIES, FALSIFICATIONS AND INCONGRUENCIES IN ACCORDANCE TO MR. EHLERS' STATEMENTS ABOUT 02-MAR-12.

MR. EHLERS' RESPONSES

FIRST, MR. EHLERS RESPONDS BY WAY OF A DENIAL OF THE ALLEGATIONS AGAINST HIM. SECOND, MR. EHLERS POINTS OUT THAT HIS REPRESENTATION OF MYSELF FALLS WELL WITHIN THE EXPECTED QUALITY OF SERVICE PROVIDED TO CLIENTS WHO RETAIN COUNSEL FOR A DEFENCE IN CRIMINAL MATTERS (I AM UNCERTAIN WHETHER MR. EHLERS IS REFERENCING A LAWYER'S QUALITY OF SERVICE ACT OR NOT BUT I WOULD GREATLY APPRECIATE IT IF I COULD BE INFORMED ABOUT THE ACT AND PROVIDED A COPY OF SAID ACT). THIRD, FROM MR. EHLERS' VIEW IN FACT, THAT SUBJECT TO FACTORS BEYOND COUNSEL'S CONTROL, THAT I RECEIVED LEGAL SERVICES WHICH EXCEEDED THE AVERAGE STANDARD PROVIDED TO CLIENTS IN HIS POSITION. FOURTH, MR. EHLERS ENSURES TO DRAW ATTENTION TO ME BY STATING THAT I AM NO STRANGER TO THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM IN CANADA. FIFTH, MR. EHLERS PROCEEDS TO EXPLAIN THAT HE APPARENTLY EXPLAINED TO ME ON SEVERAL OCCASIONS THAT COUNSEL MUST FOLLOW REQUIRED PROTOCOL WHICH INCLUDES BUT IS NOT LIMITED TO BAIL HEARINGS, COURT APPEARANCES, CROWN RESOLUTION MEETINGS, JUDICIAL PRE TRIAL MEETINGS, SET DATE COURT APPLICATIONS BY CROWN AND/OR DEFENCE AND FINALLY A TRIAL AND SENTENCING HEARING IF REQUIRED. SIXTH, MR. EHLERS ARTICULATES FROM HIS APPARENT PERSPECTIVE WITH HIS NEGATIVE UNDERLYING CONDESCENDING CONNOTATIONS THAT MY CASE, GIVEN MY INITIAL INDECISIVE APPROACH TO RETAINING COUNSEL, MY LACK OF CLEAR INSTRUCTION TO COUNSEL ONCE RETAINED, MY TANGENTIAL REASONING RELATED TO ISSUES OF FACT AND LAW, MY CONTINUED INSISTENCE THAT MY BEHAVIOR LEADING TO THE CRIMINAL ALLEGATIONS WAS NOT CRIMINAL IN NATURE AS WELL AS MY REFUSAL TO FOLLOW THE ADVICE OF COUNSEL, MADE MY CASE CHALLENGING AND REQUIRED EFFORT AND EXPENSE OF COUNSEL WHICH EXCEEDED THE CRIMINAL LEGAL SERVICES NORMALLY PROVIDED.

IN MY PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT OF THE ABOVE NOTED RESPONSES OF MR. EHLERS HE ONLY RESPONDS BY WAY OF A DENIAL OF THE ALLEGATIONS AGAINST HIM. AT NO TIME IN THE CONTENTS OF HIS LETTER DOES MR. EHLERS STATE THAT MY COMPLAINTS ARE UNWARRANTED ESPECIALLY CONSIDERING THE FACTS THAT I HAVE CONTINUOUSLY DELIBERATELY TRIED TO SUBSTANTIATE MY COMPLAINTS CONCERNING THIS ISSUE. MR. EHLERS HAS INTENTIONALLY TRIED

TO SHIFT AND DELECT ATTENTION AWAY FROM HIS MISCONDUCT BY FORGING AHEAD WITH A COY AND SLY PRE-MEDITATED PRODDED AND CONTRIVED PLAN TO DISCREDIT ME BY MANIPULATING AND TRANSFERRING THE BLAME ONTO ME IN ACCORDANCE TO THE IMPROPRIETIES AND WRONGDOINGS THAT MR. EHLERS HAS HAD NO PROBLEMS AND NO SHAME IN COMMITTING THESE ACTS AGAINST ME. MR. EHLERS HAS PROCEEDED TO SUCH GREAT LENGTHS TO ATTEMPT TO PORTRAY THAT I RECEIVED LEGAL SERVICES WHICH EXCEEDED THE AVERAGE STANDARD PROVIDED TO CLIENTS IN MY POSITION. NOTHING COULD BE FURTHER FROM THE TRUTH. MR. EHLERS BARELY WOULD HAVE CONTACT WITH ME AND ANY CONTACT MR. EHLERS DID HAVE WITH ME WAS VERY BRIEF AS IT RELATED TO TIME. NEXT, I HAVE NO IDEA WHAT MR. EHLERS MEANS WHEN HE STATED "SUBJECT TO FACTORS BEHIND COUNSEL'S CONTROL." MR. EHLERS VAGUE, AMBIGUOUS AND BROAD REMARKS ARE CONTAINED THROUGHOUT THE CONTENTS OF HIS 6 PAGE LETTER. IT BARELY APPEARS THAT MR. EHLERS IN A CONVINCING MANNER IS POSSIBLY ATTEMPTING TO INTENTIONALLY DISCREDIT MY MENTAL HEALTH IN ORDER TO MASK THE INITIAL MISCONDUCT, ILLEGAL ACTIONS AND TRANSGRESSIONS THAT HE ENGAGED HIMSELF IN. MR. EHLERS FEAR OF RESPONDING TO MY SPECIFIC COMPLAINTS IS HIGHLY EVIDENT AS MR. EHLERS DOES NOT ADDRESS MANY OF THE ISSUES AND CONCERNS I HAVE RAISED. I AM ENTIRELY DUMBFOUNDED BY MR. EHLERS' ASSERTIONS THAT ON SEVERAL OCCASIONS HE MUST FOLLOW REQUIRED PROTOCOL AS IT RELATES TO THE EXTENSIVE LIST THAT MR. EHLERS PROVIDED. FIRST, MR. EHLERS NEVER EXPLAINED THE PROTOCOLS ON SEVERAL OCCASIONS AS MR. EHLERS SUGGESTS. SECOND, IT APPEARS THAT MR. EHLERS MAY BE ATTEMPTING TO IMPLY THAT I MAY HAVE ASKED HIM NOT TO FOLLOW PROTOCOL WHICH WOULD BE TOTALLY AND ENTIRELY FALSE, IF INDEED THIS IS PART OF MR. EHLERS COVER-UPS. THIRD, I WANT TO EMPHATICALLY STATE THAT UNTIL RECENTLY IN AUGUST 2012 I NEVER KNEW THERE WAS SOMETHING REFERRED TO AS SET DATE COURT AS MR. EHLERS REPRESENTS. SO FOR MR. EHLERS TO SUGGEST HE DISCUSSED THIS WITH ME IS ABSOLUTELY ABSURD. FINALLY, THE MANNER IN WHICH MR. EHLERS REPRESENTS THAT HE DISCUSSED THE CUMULATIVE NUMBER OF PROTOCOLS WITH ME IS SOMEWHAT CONFUSING. IT APPEARS THAT MR. EHLERS MAY BE IMPLYING THAT ON SEVERAL OCCASIONS HE DISCUSSED ALL OF THESE PROTOCOLS WITH ME. IF INDEED THAT IS MR. EHLERS INTENT HERE, HE WOULD BE LYING AGAIN. AS IT RELATES TO A SENTENCING HEARING, MR. EHLERS NEVER DISCUSSED THIS WITH ME EITHER BECAUSE MY MATTER WAS NOWHERE NEAR THAT STAGE. CERTAIN PARAMETERS OF A SENTENCE UPON A PLEA WERE CONSIDERED BUT NOT A SENTENCING HEARING.

SOLICITOR-CLIENT PRIVILEGE

MR. EHLERS PROVIDES ELABORATIVE AND CONSIDERABLE DETAIL ABOUT SACRED INFORMATION THAT SHOULD BE PROTECTED BY SOLICITOR-CLIENT PRIVILEGE. THIS INFORMATION IS PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL IN NATURE, HOWEVER, IT APPEARS THAT MR. EHLERS HAS FELT THE DIRE NECESSITY TO CROSS BOUNDARIES AS IT RELATES TO MY COMPLAINTS. WELL I AM COGNIZANT OF THE FACT THAT MR. EHLERS WOULD HAVE PROBABLY HAD TO REFER TO CERTAIN ASPECTS OF THIS INFORMATION AS PART OF HIS RESPONSE, I WILL STATE THAT VARIOUS PARTS OF THIS INFORMATION THAT MR. EHLERS DIVULGED WERE IRRELEVANT TO MY COMPLAINTS, ISSUES AND CONCERNS. NEXT, LET ME POINT OUT THAT THE STATEMENTS THAT MR. EHLERS ALLUDES TO ABOUT OUR SOLICITOR-CLIENT PRIVILEGE CONTAIN A SUBSTANTIAL AMOUNT OF LIES, INACCURACIES, MISREPRESENTATIONS, FALSIFICATIONS AND FABRICATIONS. SINCE THERE ARE OUTSTANDING LEGALITIES AND AN OUTSTANDING CHARGE, I AM NOT GOING TO EXPAND ABOUT THE LIES, FABRICATIONS AND FALSIFICATIONS THAT MR. EHLERS PROVIDES IN REZATION TO OUR SOLICITOR-CLIENT PRIVILEGE AT THIS TIME. MOREOVER I WILL STATE THAT I BELIEVE IT IS A TRAVESTY HE HAS FELT IT NECESSARY TO REVEAL NUMEROUS ASPECTS OF OUR SOLICITOR-CLIENT PRIVILEGE. THIS IS MR. EHLERS CHOICE AND PEROGATIVE BUT, I MUST NOTE THAT THIS MAY BE PART OF A PRE-CALCULATED PLAN TO INTENTIONALLY CAUSE ME FURTHER HARM, INJURIES AND LOSSES IN THE EVENT THAT YOUR RECORDS WERE EVER SUBPOENAED TO COURT IN THE FUTURE. MR. EHLERS MAY HAVE POSSIBLY BREACHED OUR SOLICITOR-CLIENT PRIVILEGE BUT, I DO NOT POSSESS THE LEGAL KNOWLEDGE AND/OR LEGAL RESOURCES TO DEFINITELY COME TO THIS CONCLUSION AT THIS POINT IN TIME.

COPIES OF MR. EHLERS' NOTES, MR. EHLERS' MEMOS AND ANY LEGAL RESOURCES MR. EHLERS USED

I WOULD GREATLY APPRECIATE BEING FORWARDED A COPY OF MR. EHLERS' MEMOS DATED THE 16-FEB-12 AND THE 29-FEB-12, RESPECTIVELY. PLEASE ENCLOSE ANY ADDITIONAL MEMOS THAT MR. EHLERS PROVIDED TO THE LAW SOCIETY OF UPPER CANADA IN REGARD TO THIS MATTER. I WILL POLITELY REQUEST THAT YOU PLEASE ALSO FORWARD ME A COPY OF MR. EHLERS' NOTES DATED THE 02-MAR-12 AND THE 19-MAR-12, RESPECTIVELY. PLEASE ALSO ENCLOSE ANY OTHER NOTES

THAT MR. EHLERS HAS INCLUDED IN HIS RESPONSE TO YOUR AGENCY, PLEASE ALSO FORWARD ME A COPY OF ANY ACTS, ANY LEGISLATION AND ANY OTHER LEGAL RESOURCES MR. EHLERS HAS REFERENCED AND/OR CITED. I REALIZE THAT THIS MAY REQUIRE SOME EXTRA EFFORT BECAUSE MR. EHLERS HAS NOT PROVIDED ANY FOOTNOTES TO IDENTIFY ANY RESOURCES HE MAY HAVE USED. FINALLY, IF YOUR ORGANIZATION HAS RECEIVED AND/OR OBTAINED ANY OTHER DOCUMENTATION, INFORMATION AND/OR EVIDENCE TO POSSIBLY PROVIDE MR. EHLERS WITH AN ALIBI AND/OR SUPPORT FOR HIS COVER-UPS THAN I WOULD GREATLY APPRECIATE BEING FORWARDED A COPY OF ANY SUCH CORRESPONDENCES. IF ANY DOCUMENTATION SUCH AS THIS EXISTS I MAY HAVE CORRESPONDENCE TO COUNTERACT ANY SUCH COLLUSION AND COVER-UPS.

IN SUMMARY

IF YOU EXTENSIVELY AND THOROUGHLY REVIEW MY COMPLAINTS IT IS HIGHLY EVIDENT THAT MR. EHLERS IS OBVIOUSLY PETRIFIED AND TERRIFIED TO WRITE ANY WRITTEN RESPONSES IN RELATION TO MY SPECIFIC COMPLAINTS. MR. EHLERS IS WELL AWARE OF MY METICULOUSLY DOCUMENTED CASE NOTES AND MR. EHLERS KNOWS THAT HE CAN NOT REFUTE THE CONTENTS THEREIN. IF MR. EHLERS WERE TO ADDRESS THE SPECIFICS OF MY COMPLAINTS HE IS COGNIZANT OF THE FACT THAT HE COULD FURTHER INCRIMINATE HIMSELF.

IT IS ALSO HIGHLY EVIDENT THAT MR. EHLERS WILL NOT HOLD HIMSELF INDEPENDENTLY ACCOUNTABLE FOR ANY AND/OR ALL OF HIS MALICIOUS, CALLOUS, REPREHENSIBLE AND INEXPLICABLE MISCONDUCT. OBVIOUSLY, MR. EHLERS DOES NOT POSSESS THE DECENCY, THE COURAGE, THE DIGNITY, THE HONOUR AND/OR THE RESPECT TO BE FORTHRIGHT BY COMING FORWARD WITH THE TRUTH. INSTEAD OF DOING WHAT IS FUNDAMENTALLY CORRECT AND RIGHT, MR. EHLERS WOULD RATHER INTENTIONALLY COMPENSATE FOR HIS INITIAL WRONGDOINGS, IMPROPRIETIES AND TRANSGRESSIONS BY ENGAGING HIMSELF IN COVER-UPS, LIES, DENIALS AND FABRICATIONS IN ORDER TO DISMISS, DISCOUNT, NEGLECT AND IGNORE MY COMPLAINTS, CONCERNS AND ISSUES. UNTIL EITHER MR. EHLERS IS BRAVE ENOUGH TO ADMIT TO THE TRUTH OR UNTIL SOMEBODY ACTUALLY DETERMINES THAT MR. EHLERS IS GUILTY OF HIS MISCONDUCT, MALTREATMENT, ILLEGAL ACTIONS AND IMPROPRIETIES, THIS WILL CONTINUE TO BE AN ON-GOING TAUTOLOGICAL MESS. FURTHERMORE,

MR. EHLERS IS HUMILIATING YOUR ORGANIZATION AND COSTING THE LAW SOCIETY OF UPPER CANADA A TON OF MONEY BY CONTINUING ON WITH HIS LIES, COVER-UPS AND FRAUDULENT MISREPRESENTATIONS AND BY ATTEMPTING TO CONVINCE YOUR AGENCY THAT HE HAS DONE NOTHING WRONG.

MY CONCLUSION WILL BE COMPLETED IN A SUCCINCT SYNOPSIS AS FEASIBLY POSSIBLE. MR. EHLERS TREATED ME IMPROPERLY, TREATED ME INAPPROPRIATELY, TREATED ME UNJUSTLY, TREATED ME UNFAIRLY, TREATED ME WITH BIASES, TREATED ME WITH PREJUDICES AND TREATED ME WITH DISCRIMINATIONS. I WILL STATE FOR THE RECORD THAT MR. EHLERS PROBABLY TREATED ME IN THIS FASHION DUE TO THE SIMPLE FACT THAT HE DID NOT LIKE ME AND AS A RESULT MR. EHLERS WANTED TO CAUSE ME HARM. MR. EHLERS MUST HAVE HAD PREVIOUS KNOWLEDGE OF THE CIVIL LAW SUITS THAT I INITIATED AND LAUNCHED AGAINST NUMEROUS PROMINENT INDIVIDUALS AND ORGANIZATIONS. MR. EHLERS PROBABLY WILL NEVER ADMIT TO HIS DISLIKE FOR ME PRIOR TO ACCEPTING MY RETAINER FOR HIS LEGAL SERVICES. ADDITIONALLY, MR. EHLERS WILL ALSO NEVER ADMIT THAT HE WOULD HAVE POSSESSED KNOWLEDGE OF THE CIVIL LAW SUITS THAT I INSTITUTED PRIOR TO TAKING ME ON AS A CLIENT OF HIS. SHORTLY AFTER MR. EHLERS AGREED TO ACCEPT MY LEGAL AID RETAINER, I EVEN WROTE MR. EHLERS A LETTER DATED THE 02-MAR-12 ASKING MR. EHLERS TO PLEASE REPRESENT MY BEST LEGAL INTERESTS IN A GENUINE, LOYAL, LEGITIMATE AND HONEST MANNER BUT, TO NO AVAIL. RIGHT FROM THE ONSET OF ACCEPTING MY CASE MR. EHLERS COULD NOT RESIST THE TEMPTATION OF PURPOSERY AND INTENTIONALLY TREATING ME IMPROPERLY. NOW THAT MR. EHLERS DOES NOT WANT TO ADMIT TO HIS DESPICABLE AND PATHETIC ACTIONS THAT HE COMMITTED AGAINST ME AND MR. EHLERS WILL BE EXTREMELY FEARFUL OF BEING REPRIMANDED. MR. EHLERS HAS RESORTED TO INVOLVING HIMSELF IN AN ENORMOUS NUMBER OF COVER-UPS, LIES, FALSIFICATIONS AND FABRICATIONS.

DUE TO THE FACT THAT I JUST RECENTLY EXAMINED AND DISSECTED MY DISCLOSURE IN THIS MATTER FOR THE FIRST TIME ON THE 16-AUG-12 AND THIS AFOREMENTIONED DISCLOSURE COULD POSSIBLY FURTHER IMPLICATE AND INCRIMINATE MR. EHLERS AS TO THE ULTERIOR MOTIVES MR. EHLERS MAY HAVE POSSESSED FOR HIS MISTREATMENT OF ME, I MUST INFORM YOU THAT I WILL BE FOLLOWING UP WITH A WRITTEN ANALYSIS AND ASSESSMENT OF SAID DISCLOSURE THAT I WILL BE FORWARDING TO YOUR ORGANIZATION IN THE NEAR FUTURE. I WILL CONTACT YOU TO DISCUSS THIS FURTHER -

IN SUMMARY

1. MR. EHLERS FAILED TO SHOW ME THE DISCLOSURE RELATED TO THIS CASE.
2. MR. EHLERS FAILED TO RESPOND TO MY LETTER DATED THE 02-MAR-12.
3. MR. EHLERS MISLED ME ABOUT THE LENGTH AND TERMS OF SENTENCE WHICH THE CROWN WAS SEEKING ON A PLEA.
4. MR. EHLERS FAILED TO INFORM ME OF THE "CROWN'S POSITION" FOLLOWING A CROWN RESOLUTION MEETING PRIOR TO MY SCHEDULED COURT APPEARANCE ON THE 19-MAR-12.
5. MR. EHLERS HAS FABRICATED AN ABUNDANCE OF LIES TO DECEPTIVELY MISREPRESENT NUMEROUS OTHER OCCURRENCES IN ORDER TO BE BENEFICIAL IN COVERING UP FOR ALL OF MR. EHLERS OTHER OPPRESSIVE MALTTREATMENT OF ME.
6. IN FACT, THE MULTIPLICITY OF LIES CONTAINED IN MR. EHLERS' 6 PAGE LETTER ARE SO SUBSTANTIAL THAT I VIRTUALLY DISCOVER AND ENCOUNTER ANOTHER LIE, ANOTHER MANIPULATION OF THE TRUTH, ANOTHER INCONSISTENCY, ANOTHER MISREPRESENTATION, ANOTHER FALSIFICATION AND/OR ANOTHER FABRICATION EACH TIME I READ MR. EHLERS' LETTER.
7. MR. EHLERS HAS RESORTED TO ENGAGING HIMSELF IN SUCH DESPERATE MEASURES TO COVER-UP FOR HIMSELF BY VIOLATING, BREAKING AND CONTRAVENING A SIGNIFICANT AMOUNT OF PROFESSIONAL, ETHICAL, MORAL AND LEGAL REGULATIONS, OBLIGATIONS, REQUIREMENTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES.

I HAVE BEEN SUBJECTED TO AND CONFRONTED WITH SOME OF THE WORST TREATMENT IMAGINABLE FROM A DEFENCE LAWYER (MR. EHLERS) TOWARD MYSELF ESPECIALLY CONSIDERING THE FACT THAT MR. EHLERS WAS SUPPOSED TO BE REPRESENTING AND DEFENDING MY BEST LEGAL INTERESTS. MR. EHLERS IS A LEGAL PROFESSIONAL WHO OCCUPIES A POSITION OF POWER, TRUST AND AUTHORITY IN OUR SOCIETY. MR. EHLERS ABUSED HIS POWER, TRUST AND AUTHORITY WHILE LEGALLY REPRESENTING ME. KNOWING FULL WELL THAT THERE WAS A DISPARAGING SOCIO-ECONOMIC GAP BETWEEN MR. EHLERS AND MYSELF, MR. EHLERS TOOK IT UPON HIMSELF TO USE THAT TO HIS ADVANTAGE WHILE CAUSING ME HARM, INJURIES AND LOSSES. NOW, MR. EHLERS HAS ABUSED HIS POWERS AND AUTHORITIES AGAIN BY ATTEMPTING TO FOOL, CONVINCING AND CONVEY TO YOU THAT HE NEVER COMMITTED ANY OF THE ACTIONS THAT I HAVE

OUTLINED IN MY LETTER DATED THE 22-MAR-12 THAT I SENT TO YOUR AGENCY.

IT IS INCREDIBLY OUTRAGEOUS AND OUTLANDISH THAT MR. EHLERS MUST BELIEVE THAT DUE TO THE OCCUPATION AND STATUS THAT HE POSSESSES IN OUR SOCIETY THAT HE IS ABLE TO FREELY ABUSE THE PROTOCOLS, GUIDELINES, STANDARDS, PROCEDURES, LAWS, ETHICS AND REGULATIONS THAT HE APPARENTLY IS SUPPOSED TO MAINTAIN, GOVERN, REGULATE AND UPHOLD WITHOUT ANY APPARENT FEAR OF SUFFERING ANY REPERCUSSIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THESE INEXCUSABLE BEHAVIORS.

MR. EHLERS SHOULD BE ORDERED TO COMPOSE AN AFFIDAVIT ATTESTING TO HIS 6 PAGE LETTER. IN ADDITION, MR. EHLERS SHOULD BE ORDERED TO TESTIFY IN A JUDICIAL INQUIRY RELATED TO THIS MATTER. I WILL RESPECTFULLY REQUEST THAT ALL CERTIFIED COURT TRANSCRIPTS BE ORDERED IN RELATION TO THIS MATTER.

MY DOCUMENTED 18 PAGE LETTER THAT I HAVE PROVIDED TO YOU IS COMPREHENSIVE, HOWEVER IT IS NOT EXHAUSTIVE BECAUSE MR. EHLERS LIES AND COVER-UPS ARE BASICALLY ENDLESS. I APOLOGIZE FOR SOME OF THE REPETITIVE REDUNDANT NOTATIONS OF MINE BUT I WANTED TO STRESS AND EMPHASIZE THE MAGNITUDE, THE SEVERITY AND THE SERIOUSNESS OF WHAT MR. EHLERS HAS DONE. THIS IS ABOUT PRINCIPLE AND MR. EHLERS (AND ANYBODY ELSE FOR THAT MATTER) SHOULD BE PERMITTED TO GET AWAY WITH ANY OF HIS PATHETIC AND DISGRACEFUL ACTIONS.

I ALSO POSSESS CONCLUSIONS ABOUT HOW THE LAW SOCIETY OF UPPER CANADA HAS DEALT WITH AND HANDLED MY COMPLAINTS TO THIS JUNCTURE AND I WILL FORWARD YOU A SEPARATE LETTER ABOUT THIS.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION TO THIS LETTER AND YOUR CONTINUED COOPERATION.

YOURS TRULY



DEREK DUNLOP -

CENTRAL NORTH CONTRIBUTORIAL CENTRE - RANGE 2/C
 1501 FULLER AVENUE
 PENETANGUISHEN, ONTARIO
 L9M 2H5

RE: LAWYER: EGINHART ENLERS
COMPLAINANT: DENIER DUNLOP
CASE NO.: 2012-106759

24-SEP-12

CHANDI SYED
COMPLAINTS RESOLUTION COUNSEL
THE LAW SOCIETY OF UPPER CANADA
OSGOODE HALL
130 QUEEN STREET WEST
TORONTO, ONTARIO M5H 2N6

DEAR MS. SYED:

I AM WRITING TO YOU TO FORWARD A COPY OF MY PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS AND ASSESSMENT OF MY DISCLOSURE IN RELATION TO MY 1 CHARGE OF CRIMINAL HARASSMENT THAT I WAS FINALLY ABLE TO PERUSE AND REVIEW FOR THE FIRST TIME ON THE 16-AUG-12. DUE TO THE FACT THAT THERE ARE OUTSTANDING LEGALITIES IN ACCORDANCE TO THIS AFOREMENTIONED DISCLOSURE I WILL REQUEST THAT MY ASSESSMENT BE KEPT IN THE STRICTEST OF CONFIDENCE. FURTHERMORE, I WILL BE INCLUDING MY CONCERNS AND ISSUES ABOUT THE MANNER IN WHICH THE LAW SOCIETY OF UPPER CANADA DEALT WITH AND HANDLED MY COMPLAINT IN REGARD TO MR. EGINHART ENLERS.

I WILL STATE FOR THE RECORD THAT MR. ENLERS' ULTERIOR MOTIVES FOR INTENTIONALLY PREVENTING ME FROM VIEWING MY DISCLOSURE ARE TIED INTO AND DIRECTLY ASSOCIATED TO SPECIFIC CONTENTS OF SAID DISCLOSURE. IT IS HIGHLY IMPORTANT TO NOTE THAT MR. ENLERS NEGLECTED AND FAILED TO NOTIFY ME ABOUT PERTINENT DETAILS OF THE NEEDED DISCLOSURE. IN ADDITION, I WILL INFORM YOU THAT MR. ENLERS PURPOSELY WOULD NOT HAVE WANTED ME TO SEE, WITNESS AND/OR VIEW CERTAIN ASPECTS OF THE DISCLOSURE. THERE ARE NUMEROUS PARTS OF THE DISCLOSURE THAT MR. ENLERS NEVER WANTED ME TO LOOK AT AND THIS IS ANOTHER REASON WHY HE WOULD NOT SHOW ME ANY OF THE DISCLOSURE. ADDITIONALLY, IT ALSO MUST BE NOTED THAT MR. ENLERS WAS ATTEMPTING TO INDUCE, ENTICE AND ENTRAP ME INTO SUCCEEDING TO A GUILTY PLEA. ONE MAJOR EXAMPLE OF THIS WAS DUE TO THE FACT THAT THE EMERGENCY DISPOSAL UNIT OF THE O.P.P. WAS CONTRACTED BY THE ALLEGED COMPLAINANT AND MR. ENLERS NEVER INFORMED ME ABOUT THIS ASPECT OF THE DISCLOSURE. IN ADDITION, IT IS HIGHLY APPARENT

THAT THERE ARE AN ENORMOUS AMOUNT OF OTHER FACTS OF THE DISCLOSURE THAT MR. ENLERS WOULD NOT HAVE WANTED ME TO WITNESS PRIOR TO ENTERING A GUILTY PLEA.

I AM GOING TO EXPRESS TO YOU MY CONCERNS ABOUT HOW THE LAW SOCIETY OF UPPER CANADA HANDLED MY COMPLAINTS IN RELATION TO THE MISCONDUCT OF MR. ENLERS. I POSSESS SOME VERY SERIOUS AND SIGNIFICANT RESERVATIONS INTO THE PROCESS IN WHICH MY ISSUES WERE DEALT WITH. FIRST, I AM UNCERTAIN ABOUT YOUR PROCEDURES AND WHETHER THERE IS A DISTINGUISHABLE AND DISCERNABLE DIFFERENCE THAT WOULD EXIST BETWEEN A COMPLAINT BEING FORWARDED TO THE INVESTIGATIONS DEPARTMENT OF THE LAW SOCIETY OF UPPER CANADA AND A COMPLAINT THAT WOULD HAVE BEEN FORWARDED TO THE COMPLAINTS RESOLUTION DEPARTMENT OF THE LAW SOCIETY OF UPPER CANADA. AT NO TIME DID I FILL OUT AND COMPLETE THE LAW SOCIETY'S FORMS IN RELATION TO FILING A COMPLAINT WITH YOUR AGENCY AND NOR WAS I EVER ASKED AND/OR ADVISED BY A STAFF MEMBER OF YOUR ORGANIZATION TO DO SO. I WOULD GREATLY APPRECIATE BEING NOTIFIED ABOUT THE REASONS WHY MY LETTER DATED THE 22-MAR-12 WAS EVENTUALLY SENT TO MRS. CHANDI SYED (YOURSELF) OF THE COMPLAINTS RESOLUTION DEPARTMENT AS OPPOSED TO YOUR INVESTIGATIONS UNIT. I WOULD ALSO GREATLY APPRECIATE BEING ADVISED ABOUT THE FACT(S) IF THERE IS A SUBSTANTIAL DIFFERENCE(S) BETWEEN A MATTER BEING REFERRED TO THE COMPLAINTS RESOLUTION DEPARTMENT AS OPPOSED TO THE INVESTIGATIONS DEPARTMENT. HOWEVER, I WILL RESPECTFULLY REQUEST THAT YOU PROVIDE ME WITH THE CRITERIA FOR THIS DECISION THAT WAS MADE IN RELATION TO MY COMPLAINTS.

NEXT, I WILL AGAIN NOTIFY YOU THAT I AM EXTREMELY CONCERNED ABOUT THE FACT THAT YOU FORWARDED MR. ENLERS A COPY OF MY PRIVATE CONFIDENTIAL/PROBESLY DOCUMENTED CASE NOTES PRIOR TO RECEIVING MR. ENLERS' INITIAL RESPONSES TO MY LETTER DATED THE 22-MAR-12. I WILL STATE THAT YOU COMPROMISED AND SEPARATED THE INTEGRITY AND CREDIBILITY OF THE LAW SOCIETY'S INVESTIGATION INTO MY COMPLAINTS BY SENDING MR. ENLERS A COPY OF MY CASE NOTES. MORE SPECIFICALLY, THESE SAID CASE NOTES SHOULD NOT HAVE BEEN FORWARDED TO MR. ENLERS UNTIL A MUCH LATER TIME AND POSSIBLY NEVER SENT TO HIM AT ALL. AS A RESULT, I AM GOING TO SUGGEST THAT THIS WAS

PART OF A PRE-ORGANIZED AND PRE-CALCULATED PLAN TO PURPOSELY ASSIST MR. EHLERS WITH HIS COVER-UPS. IT IS NOW EVIDENT THAT THE LAW SOCIETY HAS IMPLICATED AND INCRIMINATED YOURSELVES IN THESE ON-GOING COVER-UPS. ADDITIONALLY, FOR YOU TO IMPLY THAT I DID NOT REQUEST THAT MY CASE NOTES NOT BE RELEASED TO MR. EHLERS IS JUST ANOTHER STRATEGICALLY PLANNED INITIATIVE FOR COVERING UP FOR MR. EHLERS. I MUST ALSO NOTE THAT IT IS RATHER IRONIC AND HYPOCRITICAL THAT YOU SENT ME A LETTER AFTER RECEIVING THE 6 LETTERS FROM MY NUMBER ASKING ME WHETHER I WANTED THESE 6 LETTERS FORWARDED TO MR. EHLERS OR NOT. THIS A DOUBLE STANDARD AND IS IN DIRECT CONTRADICTION TO THE PROCESS YOU FOLLOWED WITH MY CASE NOTES.

FINALLY, THE CONFLICT OF INTEREST (S) ISSUES THAT I RAISED IN REGARD TO MR. EHLERS AND MR. DEREK WIDDICKS OF SIMCOE C.A.S. WERE NEVER REFERENCED BY MR. EHLERS. IT IS OBVIOUS THAT MR. EHLERS IS RETICENT TO ADDRESS THESE ASPECTS OF MY COMPLAINTS. ONCE AGAIN, I WILL STATE THAT THERE IS SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE TO REVEAL THAT THERE WAS AN IDENTIFIABLE CONFLICT OF INTEREST. I WILL RECOMMEND AND POLITELY REQUEST THAT YOUR AGENCY RE-OPEN THE CONFLICT OF INTEREST ASPECT OF THIS INVESTIGATION AND DIRECT YOU TO START BY PLACING A TELEPHONE CALL TO SIMCOE C.A.S. TO DETERMINE WHAT INVOLVEMENT MR. EHLERS DIRECTLY AND/OR INDIRECTLY HAD WITH MR. WIDDICKS AND/OR ANY OF HIS CLIENTS/CASELOADS.

IF THERE CONTINUES TO BE UNSATISFACTORY METHODS USED BY YOUR AGENCY I WILL EVENTUALLY REQUEST THAT A SUPERVISOR/SUPERIOR ASSUME CARRIAGE OF THIS FILE.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONTINUED CONSIDERATION AND ATTENTION FOR THIS LETTER.

YOURS TRULY,

Derek Dunlop

DEREK DUNLOP

CENTRAL MENTAL CORRECTIONAL CENTRE - RANCE B-C.

1501 FULLER AVENUE

PENETA, KANSASVILLE, ONTARIO

L9M 2H4.

ENCLOSURE: ASSESSMENT OF DISCLOSURE - 5 PAGES

12-NOV-12

CHANDI SYED, COMPLAINTS RESOLUTION COUNSEL

THE LAW SOCIETY OF UPPER CANADA

130 QUEEN STREET WEST

TORONTO, ONTARIO M5H 2N6

RE: LAWYER: EGINHART EHLERS

COMPLAINANT: DEREK DUNLOP

CASE NO: 2012 - 106759

DEAR MS. SYED:

I AM WRITING TO YOU TO FOLLOW-UP WITH ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IN CONJUNCTION TO MY TWO MOST RECENT CORRESPONDENCES DELIVERED TO YOUR ORGANIZATION. THE FIRST DOCUMENT FORWARDED TO YOUR DIRECT ATTENTION WAS THE 18-PAGE LETTER DATED THE 10-SEP-12 AND THE SECOND LETTER ADDRESSED TO YOUR PERSON WAS THE 3-PAGE LETTER WITH AN ACCOMPANYING 5-PAGE ENCLOSURE (INITIAL ASSESSMENT OF MY DISCLOSURE). I WILL ACKNOWLEDGE AND I AM COGNIZANT OF THE FACT(S) THAT THERE WOULD BE A SIGNIFICANT NUMBER OF AREAS OF CONCERN TO EXTENSIVELY, THOROUGHLY AND COMPREHENSIVELY DISSECT, DIGEST, ANALYZE AND ASSESS PRIOR TO RENDERING, ISSUING AND SUBMITTING ANY CONCLUSIVE JUDGMENT. AT THIS POINT, I POSSESS NO ISSUE WITH THE FACT THAT I HAVE NOT HEARD FROM YOU AS I REALIZE THE ENORMOUS AMOUNT OF WORK THAT WOULD NEED TO BE PROFESSIONALLY CONDUCTED AND COMPLETED BEFORE THE ISSUANCE OF ANY FINAL DRAFTED SUMMARY/OUTCOME IN ACCORDANCE TO MY COMPLAINTS AND CONCERNS AS IT IS RELATED TO MR. EGINHART EHLERS. MY OBJECTIVE IS TO POINT OUT ADDITIONAL AREAS OF MY ISSUES WITH MR. EGINHART EHLERS AND HIS VIRTUALLY ENDLESS SHORTCOMINGS, MISCONDUCT, CONVICTIONS AND ILLEGAL ACTIONS THAT HE HAS INTENTIONALLY ENGAGED HIMSELF IN. IT IS NOT TO INUNDATE YOU WITH ADDITIONAL PAPERWORK. I WANT TO EMPHATICALLY STATE FOR THE RECORD THAT IT IS INCREDIBLY UNBELIEVABLE THAT MR. EHLERS WOULD VEHEMENTLY DENY THAT MR. EHLERS DID NOT COMMIT ANY OF THE ALLEGATIONS, COMPLAINTS AND CONCERNS MADE AGAINST

HIM. THE FACT THAT MR. ENLERS HAS CONSTRUCTED AND DEVISED A PRE-MEDITATED AND PRE-CALCULATED SCHEME TO PURPOSELY COVER-UP FOR ALL OF HIS INITIAL CRIMES, MISCONDUCT, IMPROPRIETIES, TRANSGRESSIONS AND INDISCRETIONS IS EVEN MORE DISGRACEFUL, PATHETIC, OUTRAGEOUS AND OUBTERNOUS.

FIRST, I WANT TO DRAW YOUR ATTENTION TO PAGE # 2 - PARAGRAPH # 5 WHERE MR. ENLERS STATES THAT "I DISCUSSED WITH MR. DUNCAN THE NEED TO UNDERSTAND THAT TRIALS ARE PRIMARILY BASED ON PRESENTATION OF RELEVANT EVIDENCE AND NOT ON "THE TRUTH" AS THIS IS OFTEN A SUBJECTIVE CONCEPT WHICH COURTS CANNOT AND DO NOT ADJUDICATE ON," ONCE AGAIN, MR. ENLERS NEVER DISCUSSED THIS CONCEPT WITH ME AND IF MR. ENLERS HAD REVEALED THIS TO ME, I CAN UNEQUIVOCALLY NOTIFY YOU THAT I WOULD HAVE NEVER EVEN ENTERTAINED ANY POSSIBILITY OF HIRING MR. ENLERS TO REPRESENT MY LEGAL INTERESTS IN THE FIRST PLACE AND I WOULD HAVE NOTIFIED MR. ENLERS ACCORDINGLY AND DISCONTINUED ANY AND ALL CONTACT WITH HIM AT THAT TIME. FOR MR. ENLERS TO INSINUATE THAT HE DISCUSSED THIS WITH ME IS TOTALLY AND ENTIRELY FALSE AND ABSURD. NEXT, THE SHOCK AND SURPRISE THAT I ENCOUNTERED UPON READING THIS STATEMENT IS ALMOST BEYOND COMPREHENSION AS IT RELATES TO THE FACT THAT ANY ATTORNEY EMPLOYED AS A DEFENSE LAWYER IN OUR LEGAL SYSTEM WOULD ACTUALLY MAKE SUCH A DIAMETRICALLY OPPOSED CONTRADICTION IN THE SAME SENTENCE, WHETHER IT IS INDEED TRUE OR NOT. MY EXPERIENCE AS A PROFESSIONAL C.A.S. WORKER / INVESTIGATOR AND AS A PROBATION OFFICER WOULD DIRECTLY CONTRADICT THIS REFORMULATED STATEMENT OF MR. ENLERS. FROM WHAT I KNOW AND I HAVE BEEN TAUGHT, ONE OF THE MAIN PURPOSES OF ANY COURT PROCEEDING, ESPECIALLY A TRIAL IS TO DETERMINE THE TRUTH. I CAN'T IMAGINE THE INCENSED REACTION AND DESPAIR OF MANY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC IF THEY WERE ACTUALLY TO READ A SENTENCE OF THIS MAGNITUDE COMPILED BY A DEFENCE ATTORNEY IN OUR JUDICIAL SYSTEM. FURTHERMORE, I AM PERSONALLY DUMBFOUNDED AND BEMOILED TO HEAR THAT MR. ENLERS ASSERTS THAT TRIALS ARE BASED ON THE PRESENTATION OF RELEVANT EVIDENCE AND NOT ON THE TRUTH. I WAS ALWAYS UNDER THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THE PRIMARY OBJECTIVE OF A TRIAL IN A COURT OF LAW WAS TO UNVEIL, REVEAL AND UNCOVER THE TRUTH. I WOULD ALSO HAVE TO SUSPECT THAT A VAST MAJORITY OF CITIZENS INHABITING OUR SOCIETIES WOULD BE IN AGREEMENT WITH ME AND PARALLELED WITH MR. ENLERS' ASSERTION.


SINCE MR. ENLERS WAS MADE AWARE OF MY NUMEROUS CONTEMPORANEOUSLY DOCUMENTED CASE NOTES AGAINST HIM, MR. ENLERS WAS PROVIDED THE OPPORTUNITY TO PURPOSELY DEVISE AND CREATE A PRE-ORGANIZED STRATEGY TO PLACE AND DIRECT A HEAVY EMPHASIS ON THE VIDEO-COURT PROCEEDINGS OF THE 02-MAR-12 IN ORDER TO INTENTIONNELY CONTRIBUTE TO HIS COVER-UPS. IT IS HIGHLY EVIDENT THAT MR. ENLERS HAS PRIMARILY USED THE 02-MAR-12 COURT PROCEEDINGS AS THE PRIMARY SCAPEGOAT FOR MANY OF HIS ILLEGAL ACTIONS, MISCONDUCT, CRIMES, COLLUSION AND COVER-UPS. THIS BASICALLY IS THE ONLY COURT DATE THAT PROVIDED MR. ENLERS SUCH AN OPORVING AND MR. ENLERS WAS SO DESPERATE HE TOOK FULL ADVANTAGE OF THE 02-MAR-12. THIS IS A GIGANTIC PART OF ONE OF MR. ENLERS COY, SLY AND MANIPULATIVE PRE-DETERMINED PLANS TO PURPOSELY COVER-UP FOR HIMSELF WHICH IS AN ASSOLUTE DISGRACE. ANY INVESTIGATOR AND ANYBODY FOR THAT MATTER SHOULD BE ABLE TO SEE RIGHT THROUGH THIS PRE-CALCULATED SCHEME OF MR. ENLERS TO DIVERT, DETRACT AND REFLECT ATTENTION AWAY FROM ALL OF HIS IMPROPER AND INAPPROPRIATE ACTIONS.

IN ADDITION, PLEASE LET ME NOTIFY YOU THAT UPON SUBSEQUENT REVIEW(S) OF MY DISCLOSURE AT THE C.N.C.C. I HAVE FURTHER ENCOUNTERED A NUMBER OF OTHER ISSUES IN RELATION TO THE ON-GOING AND RAMPANT COLLUSION AND COVER-UPS TRANSPERING. I HAVE DOCUMENTED NOTATIONS OF THE AFOREMENTIONED PROBLEMS AND I BELIEVE IT IS IMPERATIVE FOR ME TO FORWARD TO YOU A COPY OF MY ASSESSMENT AND ANALYSIS OF THIS DISCOVERY. AS I HAVE STATED TO PEOPLE BEFORE, SOMEBODY, SOMEWHERE, SOMEDAY NEEDS TO BE BRAVE ENOUGH TO COME FORWARD WITH THE TRUTH.

IN REGARDS TO MR. ENLERS 6 PAGE LETTER DATED THE 17-AUG-12 THERE ARE STILL A CONSIDERABLE AMOUNT OF OUTSTANDING LIES, FABRICATIONS, FALSIFICATIONS AND COVER-UPS BUT I DO NOT WANT TO CONTINUE TO BELABOUR THESE CONCERNS AND/OR POSSIBLY BE REDUNDANT.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONTINUED COOPERATION AND I HOPE YOU DO THE RIGHT THING.

YOURS TRULY,



DEREK DUNLOP -

CENTRAL NORTH CORRECTIONAL CENTRE - RANGE 1-C
1501 FILLMORE AVENUE
PENNINGTONVILLE, ONTARIO L9M 2M4.

04-DEC-12.

CHANDI SYED

COMPLAINTS RESOLUTION DEPARTMENT

THE LAW SOCIETY OF UPPER CANADA

130 QUEEN STREET WEST

TORONTO, ONTARIO

M5H 2N6

DEAR MS. SYED :

I AM WRITING TO YOU IN RESPONSE TO YOUR PUNCTILIOUS CORRESPONDENCE DATED THE 23-NOV-12. FIRST, I AM GOING TO RESPECTFULLY REQUEST THAT EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY THAT YOU KINDLY REMOVE YOURSELF FROM THE CARRIAGE OF THIS FILE. PLEASE FORWARD TO ME A COPY OF THE LAW SOCIETY OF UPPER CANADA'S STANDARD COMPLAINTS PACKAGE IN ORDER THAT THIS MATTER BE TRANSPERDED AND ASSIGNED TO YOUR AGENCY'S INVESTIGATIVE UNIT. ADDITIONALLY, PLEASE INFORM ME OF THE NAME, TITLE AND POSITION OF EMPLOYMENT OF YOUR SUPERVISOR. NEXT, I AM GOING TO POLITELY ASK THAT YOU PLEASE PROVIDE ME WITH THE NAME OF THE GOVERNING BODY THAT WOULD OVERSEE AND HANDLE COMPLAINTS INTO THE MISCONDUCT OF EMPLOYEES OF THE LAW SOCIETY OF UPPER CANADA. IN ADDITION, I WOULD GREATLY APPRECIATE IT IF YOU COULD NOTIFY ME OF THE PROCEDURES, GUIDELINES AND PROCESSES OF INITIATING, LAUNCHING AND FILING A COMPLAINT IN REGARDS TO A PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEE OF THE LAW SOCIETY OF UPPER CANADA.

IT IS HIGHLY EVIDENT FROM THE TONE OF YOUR AFOREMENTIONED LETTER AND PREVIOUS CORRESPONDENCES OF YOURS THAT YOU POSSESS EMBLY INTENTION OF PURPOSELY ENGAGING YOURSELF AND YOUR AGENCY IN ANY ACTION AND/OR BEHAVIOR THAT WILL INTENTIONALLY ASSOCIATE MR. ENLERS IN HIS ON-GOING COVER-UPS. THE COVER-UPS, COLLUSION AND CORRUPTION ARE UBIQUITOUS AND SCURILIOUS IN NATURE. THE EGREGIOUS CONTENTS OF YOUR SAID LETTER ARE UNBELIEVABLE. OBVIOUSLY, IF MR. ENLERS NOR YOURSELF, NOR THE LAW SOCIETY OF UPPER CANADA DOES NOT POSSESS THE HONOUR, THE DIGNITY, THE RESPECT AND THE HONESTY TO

UNCOVER AND ADMIT TO THE ENTIRE TRUTH, THAN MR. ENLERS, YOURSELF AND THE LAW SOCIETY OF UPPER CANADA WILL DO ANYTHING AND EVERYTHING TO FURTHER CONTRIBUTE TO THE RAMPANT, ON-GOING, NEVER-ENDING COVER-UPS AGAINST THE PUBLIC, AGAINST THE ENTIRE JUSTICE SYSTEM, AGAINST YOURSELVES, AGAINST THE ENTIRE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE AND AGAINST MYSELF. THIS IS AN ABSOLUTE TRAVESTY AND EACH OF YOU SHOULD BE ASHAMED OF YOURSELVES. YOUR SURREPTITIOUS ACTIONS ARE MEANT TO BE PUNITIVE AND DETRIMENTAL TO ME WHILE IN TURN BEING ADVANTAGEOUS AND BENEFICIAL IN COVERING UP FOR MR. ENLERS.

I FORWARDED YOU AN 18-PAGE LETTER DATED THE 10-SEP-12 IN WHICH YOU DID NOT RESPOND TO FOR ALMOST 2½ MONTHS AND WHEN YOU DO RESPOND, YOU RESPOND IN WAY OF A BRIEF 2-PAGE LETTER THAT NEGLECTS TO, FAILS TO AND IGNORES TO REFERENCE A VAST AMOUNT OF THE CORE ISSUES IN MY 18-PAGE LETTER. NEXT, IN YOUR LETTER DATED THE 23-NOV-12, YOU'RE ESSENTIALLY PROVIDING ME WITH AN ULTIMATUM THAT IF I WANT MY LETTERS DATED THE 10-SEP-12, 24-SEP-12 AND 12-NOV-12 TO BE CONSIDERED IN THE INVESTIGATION OF MY COMPLAINT AGAINST THE LAWYER, YOU WILL NEED TO SHARE THEM WITH HIM. WHAT KIND OF FRIVOLOUS ACT IS THIS? WHAT KIND OF INVESTIGATION ARE YOU CONDUCTING? IN ESSENCE, YOU ARE SAYING THAT IF I DON'T AGREE TO SHARE THESE LETTERS WITH THE LAWYER, MR. ENLERS THAT YOU WILL NOT USE THEM IN THE INVESTIGATION. THIS IS AN "OR ELSE" OPTION AND IT IS HIGHLY SUGGESTIVE OF ANOTHER INCONSPICUOUS AND PRE-MEDITATED COVER-UP. MOREOVER, YOU ARE VIRTUALLY DETERMINING THAT MY 3 ABOVE NOTED CORRESPONDENCES ARE INCONSEQUENTIAL SHOULD MR. ENLERS NOT WITNESS THESE AND BE ABLE TO PROVIDE PERSONAL COMMENTS TO INTENTIONALLY CONTRADICT AND COVER-UP FOR HIS ALLEGED ENORMOUS AMOUNT OF LIES, FALSIFICATIONS, FABRICATIONS, ILLEGAL ACTIONS, COVER-UPS, MISCONDUCT, CRIMES AND SO ON. I AM GOING TO STATE THAT THIS MATTER DEFINITELY DOES NOT APPEAR TO BE A CASE THAT SHOULD BE HANDLED BY THE COMPLAINTS RESOLUTIONS DEPARTMENT. HOWEVER, IT IS HIGHLY APPARENT THAT THIS MATTER SHOULD NOT HAVE INITIALLY BEEN ARBITRARILY DESIGNATED TO THE COMPLAINTS RESOLUTION DEPARTMENT INITIALLY AND IN THE FIRST PLACE. AGAIN, YOU FAILED TO PROVIDE ME WITH INFORMATION ABOUT THE DISTINGUISHED AND DISCERNIBLE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN A COMPLAINT REFERRED TO YOUR INVESTIGATIONS UNIT AS OPPOSE TO A COMPLAINT REFERRED TO YOUR COMPLAINTS RESOLUTION DEPARTMENT. THE FACT

THAT YOU DID NOT RESPOND TO THESE QUERIES JUST FURTHER EXHIBITS AND DISPLAYS THE ON-GOING PREJUDICES, BIAS AND DISCRIMINATIONS THAT GROW AGAINST ME, NOT TO MENTION THE FACT, THAT THIS ON-GOING NEGLIGENCE IS COMPROMISING AND JEOPARDIZING THE INTEGRITY AND CREDIBILITY OF YOUR INVESTIGATION. MR. SYED, YOU KNOW WHAT YOU ARE DOING IS WRONG BUT IT DOES NOT APPEAR THAT YOU POSSESS A CONSCIENCE AND/OR ANY REMORSE IN RELATION TO YOUR PRE-CALCULATED ACTIONS.

MY CONTEMPORANEOUSLY DOCUMENTED CASE NOTES

MR. ENLERS ALREADY KNEW AND HAD SUFFICIENT AND ADEQUATE NOTIFICATION ABOUT THE ALLEGATIONS THAT WERE MADE AGAINST HIM AS THESE WERE OUTLINED IN MY LETTER DATED THE 22-MAR-12. I AM GOING TO STATE THAT YOU PURPOSELY FORWARDED THESE CASE NOTES OF MINE TO MR. ENLERS TO PROVIDE HIM EVERY OPPORTUNITY TO CONTRIBUTE TO HIS COVER-UPS. FOR YOU TO IMPLY AND INSINUATE THAT IT WAS A VITAL NECESSITY IN THIS INVESTIGATION AT THAT TIME IS PREPOSTEROUS, ABSURD AND RIDICULOUS. YOU JEOPARDIZE, COMPROMISED AND POSSIBLY HAVE RUINED THE INTEGRITY AND CREDIBILITY OF THIS INVESTIGATION BY FORWARDING MR. ENLERS MY CONTEMPORANEOUSLY DOCUMENTED NARRATIONS PRIOR TO RECEIVING HIS INITIAL RESPONSE(S) TO MY LETTER DATED THE 22-MAR-12. YOU DID NOT EVEN EXTEND THE PROFESSIONAL COURTESY OF ASKING ME WHETHER I WANTED TO SHARE THESE WITH MR. ENLERS OR NOT, YOU JUST WENT AHEAD AND FORWARDED THEM TO MR. ENLERS WITHOUT MY CONSENT, AUTHORIZATION AND/OR KNOWLEDGE. I DID NOT FIND OUT UNTIL AFTER THE FACT WHEN YOU NOTIFIED ME IN A LETTER THAT YOU HAD SENT THEM TO MR. ENLERS FOR HIS COMMENTS, REBUTTALS. IF YOU WANT TO ADMIT TO IT OR NOT THIS IS WRONG ON EVERY SINGLE LEVEL IMAGINABLE. THOSE CASE NOTES POSSIBLY SHOULD NOT HAVE BEEN SHARED WITH MR. ENLERS AT ALL, LET ALONE IN THE MANNER IN WHICH YOU PURPOSELY SHARED THEM WITH HIM. AGAIN THIS JUST FURTHER REVEALS AND EXHIBITS THE ON-GOING PREJUDICES, BIASED AND DISCRIMINATORY, UNJUST, UNFAIR AND IMPROPER TREATMENT THAT I AM BEING SUBJECTED TO ON AN ON-GOING AND CONSISTENT BASIS. INSTEAD OF DOING WHAT IS FUNDAMENTALLY, ETHICALLY AND MORALLY CORRECT YOU WOULD RATHER COMPROMISE FOR

ONE WRONGFUL BEHAVIOR, WITH ANOTHER WRONGFUL BEHAVIOR, WITH ANOTHER
WRONGFUL BEHAVIOR SO ON AND SO FORTH. MR. ENLERS HAS DONE THE SAME.

IN A PRE-ORGANIZED SCANDALOUS AND MENAGERIE FASHION YOU ARE INTENTIONALLY
PREVENTING AND PRECLUDING ME FROM WITNESSING MR. ENLERS' MEMOS DATED THE 16-FEB-12
AND 29-FEB-12 AS WELL AS MR. ENLERS' NOTES DATED THE 02-MAR-12 AND 19-MAR-12,
RESPECTIVELY. YOU HAVE ENGAGED YOURSELF IN A PURPOSEFUL SCHEME AND STRATEGY
TO CIRCUMVENT THE LAW SOCIETY'S REGULATION(S) AND INTENTIONALLY ATTEMPT TO
REPRESENT THAT MR. ENLERS' NOTES AND MEMOS ARE NOT PERMITTED TO BE RELEASED TO ME.
LET ME STATE THAT THIS APPEARS TO BE ANOTHER POSSIBLE ATTEMPT TO IMPLICATE AND
INCRIMINATE YOURSELF IN THE PATENT COVER-UPS. SECTION 49.12 OF THE LAW SOCIETY
ACT DEALS WITH CONFIDENTIALITY OF LAW SOCIETY REGULATORY PROCESSES. I AM
GOING TO SUGGEST THAT THE RESTRICTED INFORMATION THAT A COMPLAINANT IS NOT
ENTITLED TO IS PRIVATE COPIES OF SPECIFIC NOTICES, REPORTS AND PRODUCTS OF THE LAW
SOCIETY. NOWHERE IN THE PART OF SECTION 49.12 DOES IT SPECIFICALLY STATE THAT
MEMOS OR NOTICES OF A LAWYER ARE NOT TO BE RELEASED TO THE COMPLAINANT. LET ME
STATE THAT IT LEGITIMATELY APPEARS THAT IN A PRE-PLANNED MANNER THAT YOU HAVE INTENTIONALLY
ENCAPSULATED THAT PURSUANT TO THE LEGISLATION THAT THE LAW SOCIETY DOES NOT
HAVE STATUTORY AUTHORITY OR OBLIGATION TO PROVIDE A COMPLAINANT WITH COPIES OF INTERNAL
LAW FIRM MEMOS, ON CONSENT OR OTHERWISE, EVEN THOUGH YOU HAVE INTENTIONALLY TRY TO REPRESENT
THAT THIS INDEED IS THE CASE, YOU ARE DOING THIS IN A PRE-MEDITATED MANNER. THERE ARE NO
SPECIFICS IN THE LEGISLATION THAT ACCURATELY REFLECT AND DEPICTS YOUR ACTUAL REFERENCES.
HOWEVER, IT IS A DOUBLE STANDARD AS IT RELATES TO THE COMPLAINANT AND THE LAWYER AND
IT IS NOT IN THE PUBLIC INTERESTS. PLEASE FORWARD TO ME A COPY OF MR. ENLERS' MEMOS
DATED THE 16-FEB-12 AND 29-FEB-12 AS WELL AS MR. ENLERS' NOTICES DATED THE 02-MAR-12
AND 19-MAR-12. ALSO, PLEASE FORWARD TO ME A COPY OF ANY OTHER NOTES, MEMOS AND OR
WRITTEN STATEMENTS PROVIDED TO YOU BY MR. ENLERS. THIS WOULD BE PART OF A FULL, FAIR
AND TRANSPARENT INVESTIGATION. OTHERWISE, YOUR INDECOROUS AND NEARLUS ACTIONS ARE
ONLY FURTHER EVIDENCED AS IT RELATES TO THE ON-GOING COVER-UPS AND COLLUSION. AGAIN,
THESE BEHAVIORS ARE PREJUDICIAL, DISCRIMINATORY, BIASED, UNJUST, UNFAIR AND IMPROPER TOWARDS ME.

YOU ARE FURTHER COMPROMISING AND JEOPARDIZING THE INTEGRITY AND CREDIBILITY OF THE INVESTIGATION BY IGNORING, NEGLECTING AND FAILING TO RESPOND TO AN ENORMOUS NUMBER OF COMPONENTS OF MY LETTERS. FURTHERMORE, THIS INTENTIONAL MALFEASANCE DIRECTED TOWARDS ME IS PREJUDICIAL, BIASED, DISCRIMINATORY, UNMOTIVATED, UNJUST, UNFAIR, INAPPROPRIATE, UNPROFESSIONAL AND IMPROPER. ADDITIONALLY, IT IS NOT IN THE PUBLIC INTERESTS FOR AN INVESTIGATION OF THIS MAGNITUDE TO BE CONDUCTED THIS POORLY, UNPROFESSIONALLY WITH THE PURPOSEFUL INTENT TO COVER-UP FOR MR. EHLERS.

MY 18 - PAGE LETTER DATED 10-SEP-12

- ① YOU FAILED TO RESPOND TO THE ASPECT OF MY LETTER THAT REFERENCES MR. EHLERS' RETAINER-PAGES #10 AND #11.
- ② YOU NEGLECTED TO RESPOND TO THE COMPONENT OF MY LETTER THAT REFERENCES THE 02-MAR-12 ON PAGE #11.
- ③ YOU PROVIDED NO RESPONSE IN ACCORDANCE TO MR. EHLERS' RESPONSES ON PAGES #12 AND #13.
- ④ YOU IGNORED THE IN SUMMARY ASPECT OF MY LETTER ON PAGES #15 AND #16.
- ⑤ YOU HAVE FAILED TO, NEGLECTED AND IGNORED TO RESPOND TO THE 7 POINTS THAT I HAVE CONTAINED IN MY SUMMARY ON PAGE #17.
- ⑥ YOU DID NOT RESPOND TO THE FACT THAT MR. EHLERS HAS NOT RESPONDED TO SPECIFICS OF MY COMPLAINTS.
- ⑦ YOU DID NOT PROVIDE, INDICATE AND/OR MAKE ANY REFERENCE TO MY REQUESTS FOR ANY ACTS AND/OR LEGISLATION THAT MR. EHLERS MAY BE REFERRING TO (10 - QUANTITY ASSURANCE ACT AND SO ON).

MY LETTER DATED 21-SEP-12

- ① YOU DID NOT RESPOND AND/OR PROVIDE ANY REFERENCE TO MY ANALYSIS OF THE DISCLOSURE THAT I FORWARDED TO YOU.
- ② YOU PROVIDED NO RESPONSE TO ME ABOUT MR. EHLERS' REFUSING TO SHOW ME THE DISCURE,

③ YOU FAILED TO RESPOND TO MY QUESTIONS ABOUT MY COMPLAINT BEING FORWARDED TO THE COMPLAINTS RESOLUTION DEPARTMENT.

④ ONCE AGAIN, YOU HAVE FAILED TO ACKNOWLEDGE THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE CONFLICT OF INTEREST ASPECT OF THE INVESTIGATION IN ACCORDANCE TO MR. DEREK WIDDICKS OF SIMCOE C.A.S. YOU HAVE REPEATEDLY DISMISSED, DISCOUNTED AND DISCARDED ITS MERIT. THERE IS MORE THAN A REASONABLE LEVEL OF SUSPICION AS IT RELATES TO THE CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND I WILL REQUEST THAT YOUR AGENCY RE-OPEN THIS PART OF THE INVESTIGATION, OTHERWISE YOU ARE IMPLICATING AND INCARCERATING YOURSELF IN ADDITIONAL CONSPIRACIES BY NOT DOING SO. PLEASE COMMENCE THIS PART OF THE INVESTIGATION BY PLACING A TELEPHONE CALL TO SIMCOE C.A.S. TO DETERMINE WHAT THEIR INVOLVEMENT WITH MR. EHLERS WAS IN THE PAST.

MY LETTER DATED 12-NOV-12.

① YOU DID NOT RESPOND TO MY ASSESSMENT OF PAGE #2 - PARAGRAPH #5 OF MR. EHLERS' 6 PAGE LETTER.

② ONCE AGAIN, YOU NEGLECTED TO RESPOND TO THE ISSUES RAISED ABOUT THE 02-MAR-12.

③ YOU FAILED TO RESPOND TO ME ABOUT THE FORWARDING YOU COPIES OF MY ADDITIONAL ASSESSMENT (S) AND ANALYSIS OF MY DISCLOSURE.

INSTEAD, IN A CONTINUED MANNER YOU REQUIRED 2 1/2 MONTHS TO CREATE, DEVISE AND CONJURE UP AN ULTIMATUM THAT IS BASICALLY PREMISED ON THE FACT THAT IF I DO NOT SIGN AN ACKNOWLEDGMENT/CONSENT THAT MY LETTERS OF THE 10-SEP-12, 21-SEP-12 AND 12-NOV-12 WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED IN THE INVESTIGATION. IF YOUR RESPONSE WAS THAT PAPER YOU COULD HAVE NOTIFIED ME OF THIS A LONG TIME AGO. AFTER TAKING SUCH AN ENORMOUS AMOUNT OF TIME YOURSELF YOU THEN PROVIDED ME WITH BASICALLY TWO WEEKS TO RESPOND TO YOUR LETTER DATED THE 23-NOV-12. AGAIN THIS IS PREJUDICIAL, BIASED AND DISCRIMINATORY NOT TO MENTION IT IS A DOUBLE STANDARD. THERE ARE VARIOUS OTHER ASPECTS, PAGES AND COMPONENTS OF ALL OF MY LETTERS THAT YOU ARE FOR ALL INTENSE PURPOSES DISMISSING, NEGLECTING, IGNORING, DISCOUNTING AND DISCARDING.

I AM FLABBERGASTED AND DUMBFOUNDED TO SEE THAT FOR SOME STRANGE REASONS THAT YOU MUST FEEL A SENSE OF RESPONSIBILITY TO COVER-UP FOR MR. ENLERS WHILE YOU SIMULTANEOUSLY RISK RUINING YOUR OWN CREDIBILITY, INTEGRITY AND REPUTATION IN ORDER TO DO SO. MOREOVER, YOU MUST FEEL ENTITLED TO ABUSE YOUR POSITION OF EMPLOY, YOUR RESPECTIVE POWERS AND AUTHORITIES IN ORDER TO CONTRIBUTE TO THESE ON-GOING COVER-UPS. MORE SPECIFICALLY, YOU ARE ALSO ABUSING THE INVESTIGATIVE PROCESS TO IMPROPERLY COVER-UP FOR MR. ENLERS. IT IS HIGHLY EVIDENT THAT YOURSELF AND OTHERS WANT TO ABUSE EACH AND EVERY ONE OF YOUR POWERS TO ASSUME COMPLETE CONTROL AND AUTONOMY TO GUESS MY COMPLAINTS TO PURPOSELY MANIPULATE MR. ENLERS INITIAL CRIMES, ILLEGAL ACTIONS, COLLUSION, MISCONDUCT, COVER-UPS AND CORRUPTION WHILE ALSO BEING PERTINACIOUS IN YOUR PRE-MEDITATED ACTIONS TO ASSIST MR. ENLERS IN HIS PERNICIOUS AND COPIOUS COVER-UPS.

THE VITUPERATE ACTIONS OF MR. ENLERS IS HOLDING THE LAW SOCIETY OF UPPER CANADA, THE ENTIRE JUSTICE SYSTEM, THE ENTIRE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE, THE PUBLIC AND YOURSELF AS HOSTAGES TO ALL OF HIS IMPROPRIETIES, SHORTCOMINGS, WRONGDOINGS AND TRANSGRESSIONS. YOUR AGENCY AND YOURSELF ALREADY POSSESSES SIGNIFICANT, SUBSTANTIAL AND SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE AGAINST MR. ENLERS IN ORDER TO DETERMINE AND FIND MR. ENLERS GUILTY OF NUMEROUS LIES, FALSIFICATIONS, COVER-UPS, MISREPRESENTATIONS, ILLEGAL ACTIONS AND CRIMES. THE MISFEASANCE OF YOUR RESPECTIVE POWERS AND AUTHORITIES TO INTENTIONALLY ATTEMPT TO ENTIRELY EXONERATE AND FIND MR. ENLERS NOT GUILTY OF ANY WRONGDOINGS WOULD BE AN ABSOLUTE AND TOTAL TOXICITY TO THE ENTIRE JUSTICE SYSTEM, TO YOUR ORGANIZATION, TO THE LEGAL COMMUNITY, TO EACH AND EVERY CITIZEN OF THE PUBLIC, TO THE ENTIRE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE TO YOURSELF AND TO MYSELF.

I WILL BE PERTINACIOUS IN MY RESENTLESS AND RESILIENT PURSUIT OF UNCOVERING UNVEILING AND REVEALING THE WHOLE TRUTH AND TO CONVINCE PEOPLE SUCH AS YOURSELF THAT THEIR SPURIOUS AND INDECOROUS BEHAVIORS ARE TOTALLY AND ABSOLUTELY WRONG ON EVERY SINGLE LEVEL IMAGINABLE AND THAT THEIR INDEPENDENT AND COLLECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE MARRED THE ENTIRE JUSTICE SYSTEM.

IT IS OBVIOUS THAT MR. ENLERS, THE LAW SOCIETY AND YOURSELF HAVE ABSOLUTELY NO INTENTIONS OF BEING HONEST AND BEING PREPARED TO BE FORTHRIGHT BY COMING FORWARD WITH THE TRUTH. IT IS

HIGHLY EVIDENT THAT NONE OF YOU WILL EVER BE STRAIGHTFORWARD AND YOU WILL PROCEED WITH ALL OF YOUR PRE-CALCULATED ENDEAVOURS AND UNDERHAND SCHEMES TO CONTINUE TO CONCEAL, HIDE, DISTORT, OBSCURE AND COVER-UP THE TRUTH.

YOU HAVE AN OBLIGATION TO ORDER ALL CERTIFIED COURT TRANSCRIPTS AS IT IS RELATED TO THIS MATTER AS PART OF A FULL, FAIR AND TRANSPARENT INVESTIGATION. IF YOU DO NOT ORDER THESE TRANSCRIPTS THIS WILL JUST FURTHER DISPLAY THAT YOU ARE TERRIFIED AND PETRIFIED OF THE TRUTH SURFACING AND THIS IS JUST ANOTHER ATTEMPT TO COVER-UP FOR MR. EHLERS. ADDITIONALLY, YOU HAVE A DUTY, RESPONSIBILITY AND OBLIGATION TO RE-OPEN THE CONFLICT OF INTEREST ASPECT OF THE INVESTIGATION IN RELATION TO MR. DEREK WIDDICKS AS PART OF A FULL, FAIR AND TRANSPARENT INVESTIGATION. ANYTHING LESS WILL BE VIEWED AS PART OF COVERING UP FOR MR. EHLERS AND IT WILL BE UNACCEPTABLE.

THE TECHNICAL BEHAVIORS THAT MR. EHLERS, THE LAW SOCIETY, YOURSELF AND OTHERS ARE EXHIBITING BY TAKING ADDITIONAL ABUSIVE ADVANTAGES OF THE FACT THAT I AM BEING DETAINED IN CUSTODY ARE MORE COWARDLY, CRUEL, MALICIOUS AND OPPRESSIVE IN THEIR MERIT.

I TRULY HOPE THAT MR. EHLERS, THE LAW SOCIETY, YOURSELF AND OTHERS ARE GAINING SOME PERSONAL AND JOINT SATISFACTION(S) FROM PURPOSELY MALTREATING ME THE WAY THAT YOU ALL ARE.

PLEASE PROFESSIONALLY ADHERE TO ALL OF MY REQUESTS IN THE FIRST PARAGRAPH OF THIS LETTER.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION TO THE ENTIRE CONTENTS OF THIS CORRESPONDENCE.

YOURS TRULY,



DEREK DUNLOP

CENTRAL NORTH CORRECTIONAL CENTRE - RANGE 1-C

1501 FULLER AVENUE

PENETANGUISHENE, ONTARIO L9M 2H4



The Law Society of
Upper Canada | Barreau
du Haut-Canada

January 16, 2013

Private & Confidential

Mr. Derek Dunlop
Central North Correctional Centre
Range 1-C
1501 Fuller Avenue
Penetanguishene, Ontario L9M 2N4

Osgoode Hall
130 Queen Street West
Toronto, Ontario
M5H 2N6

Tel: (416)947-3388
Fax: (416)947-5256

Complaints Resolution
Department
Professional Regulation

A. Hershel Gross
Manager
Complaints Resolution

hgross@luc.on.ca

Dear Mr. Dunlop:

**Re: Lawyer: Eginhart Ehlers
Complainant: Derek Dunlop
Case No: 2012-106759**

As you know from the letter Chandi Syed, Complaints Resolution Counsel, sent you on December 19, 2012, I am the Manager of the Complaints Resolution Department. In that letter, Ms Syed indicated that I would contact you when I had completed my review of this matter in light of the concerns you raised in your December 4, 2012 letter to Ms Syed. As I was completing my review, I received your January 7, 2013 letter addressed to me and I have also taken that letter into consideration as part of my review. I will comment further on your January 7, 2013 letter later in this letter.

I have now completed my review of this investigation. As part of the review, I reviewed the investigation file, discussed the matter with Ms Syed and carefully considered your December 4, 2012 and January 7, 2013 letters. Based on my review, I am satisfied that, given the nature of the allegations instructed for investigation, your complaint was properly routed to the Complaints Resolution Department for investigation. Therefore, the investigation will not be transferred. Furthermore, I am satisfied that Ms Syed is conducting the investigation of the instructed allegations in an appropriate way. Therefore, there is no reason to reassign the investigation and Ms Syed will continue and complete this investigation.

I will now address the issues and concerns that you raised in your December 4, 2012 letter.

D

1. Delay in Responding to your September 10, 2012 Letter

You state: *"I forwarded you an 18-page letter dated 10-Sep-12 in which you did not respond to for almost 2 ½ months and when you did respond, you respond in a way of a brief 2-page letter that neglects to, fails to and ignores to reference a vast amount of the core issues in my 18-page letter."*

You sent Ms Syed an 18 page letter dated September 10, 2012, an 8 page letter dated September 24, 2012, and a 3 page letter dated November 12, 2012. Ms Syed had to do a detailed review of this correspondence. She responded to all three letters on November 23, 2012 and apologized for not writing to you sooner regarding your letters. In your November 12, 2012 letter, you recognized the amount of work involved in this investigation and indicated you have "no issue with the fact that I have not heard from you as I realize the enormous amount of work that would need to be professionally conducted and completed before the issuance of any final" outcome. I have spoken to Ms Syed about the importance of promptly acknowledging all communications from complainants and licensees, especially when there may be some delay in providing a substantive response and/or where there are issues that would more appropriately be dealt with at a later stage of the investigation.

2. Sharing Information with Mr. Ehlers

You state that Ms Syed, in her November 23, 2012 letter is: *"...essentially providing me with an ultimatum that if I want my letters dated the 10-Sep-12, 24-Sep-12 and 12-Nov-12 to be considered in the investigation of my complaint against the Lawyer, [she] will need to share them with him ... This is an "or else" option and it is highly suggestive of another inconspicuous and pre-meditated cover-up."*

You also state: *"I am going to state that you purposely forwarded these case notes of mine to Mr. Ehlers to provide him every opportunity to contribute to his cover-ups. ... You did not even extend the professional courtesy of asking me whether I wanted to share these with Mr. Ehlers or not, you just went ahead and forwarded them to Mr. Ehlers without my consent, authorization and/or knowledge. I did not find out until after the fact, when you notified me in a letter that you sent them to Mr. Ehlers for his comments."*

You originally took issue that Ms Syed shared your "case notes" with Mr. Ehlers on July 4, 2012. She explained to you in her August 1, August 22, and November 23, 2012 letters that the Law Society must disclose information you provide to obtain Mr. Ehlers response. She told you that Mr. Ehlers has a procedural fairness right to know the allegations made against him so that he can properly respond to and defend against those allegations. To ensure that you fully understood that she would be sharing his communications with Mr. Ehlers, she took the opportunity in her November 23, 2012 letter to ask you to sign an Acknowledgement and Consent using the language that appears on the Complaint Form.

I agree with the approach taken by Ms Syed and I do not agree with your assertion that she was motivated by some improper purpose. Law Society investigations are generally conducted on the basis that the information provided to support allegations against a licensee must be shared with that licensee to complete a full and fair investigation. It is important to hear the licensee's explanation for all the allegations and a full response requires that he or she is aware of all relevant information. You submitted your complaint by letter, however, most complainants choose the Complaint Form and would see a statement about release of information and would sign an Acknowledgement and Consent in the form submitted to you by Ms Syed with her November 23, 2012 letter. Therefore, in all the circumstances, it was reasonable for her to make the request for an Acknowledgement and Consent. I note that you signed a Complaint Form with respect to Mr. Ehlers dated January 7, 2013 (and attached it to your letter to me of that date) which includes the following:

I have read and I understand the following:

I understand that the Law Society will share some or all of the information and documents that it receives from me and other parties with the lawyer or paralegal complained about.

I agree to the Law Society sharing and providing copies of information and documents that it receives from me with the lawyer or paralegal complained about.

Therefore, I assume sharing documents with Mr. Ehlers is no longer an issue.

3. Routing of Your Complaint for Investigation

You state: "... it is highly apparent that this matter should not have initially been arbitrarily designated to the Complaints Resolution Department initially and/or in the first place. Again, you failed to provide me with information about the distinguished and discernible differences between a complaint referred to your Investigations Unit as oppose to a complaint referred to your Complaints Resolution Department. The fact that you did not respond to these queries just further exhibits and displays the on-going prejudices, biases and discriminations that grow against me. Not to mention the fact, that this on-going negligence is compromising and jeopardizing the integrity and credibility of your investigation. Ms. Syed you know what you are doing is wrong but it does not appear that you possess a conscience and/or any remorse in relation to your pre-calculated actions."

As Ms Syed correctly pointed out to you in her December 19, 2012 letter, file routing is a managerial function. Neither complainants nor licensees have any role in determining which department or which staff member will investigate a specific complaint. All Law Society investigative staff in both the Complaints Resolution Department and the Investigations Department conduct investigations within the structure created by the legislation and to the same regulatory standard. Individual investigations are routed and assigned based on the nature of allegations and the skill sets of particular investigators.

In light of your concerns, I considered whether this investigation should be transferred to another department for completion. As indicated earlier in this letter, based on my review, I am satisfied that, given the nature of the allegations instructed for investigation, your complaint was properly routed to the Complaints Resolution Department and then assigned to Ms Syed for investigation. Therefore, the investigation will not be transferred.

4. Your Request for Copies of Mr. Ehlers' File Memos

You requested copies of Mr. Ehlers' file memos dated February 16, 2012; February 29, 2012; March 2, 2012; and March 19, 2012 from the Law Society's investigation file. Ms Syed, in her November 23, 2012 letter to you, explained why the Law Society would not provide you with copies of this material obtained during the course of the investigation. In response, you state: "... you are intentionally preventing and precluding from witnessing Mr. Ehlers' memos dated the 16-Feb-12 and 29-Feb-12 as well as Mr. Ehlers' notes dated the 02-Mar-12 and 19-Mar-12, respectively. You have engaged yourself in a purposeful scheme and strategy to circumvent the Law Society's regulation(s) and intentionally attempt to represent that Mr. Ehlers' notes and memos are not permitted to be released to me. Let me state that this appears to be another feeble attempt to implicate and incriminate yourself in the rampant cover-ups. Section 49.12 of the Law Society Act deals with confidentiality of Law Society regulatory processes. I am going to suggest that the restricted information that a complainant is not entitled to is private copies of specific notations, reports, and modules of the Law Society. Nowhere in the part of section 49.12 does it specifically state that memos or notations of a lawyer are not to be released to the complainant.

As Ms Syed explained to you, pursuant to the legislation, the Law Society does not have statutory authority or obligation to provide a complainant with copies of material obtained during an investigation and a complainant is not entitled to unrestricted access to or copies of materials from an investigation file. In any investigation, the investigator must exercise discretion to determine what evidence (including memos from the file of a licensee) ought to be shared with a complainant to complete an investigation of the relevant issues. Evidence is only shared with a complainant if the investigator determines that a valid investigative purpose will be served by sharing that evidence. A request from a complainant for copies of materials from an investigation file in of itself is not a valid investigative purpose for sharing evidence. Based on my review, I am satisfied that Ms Syed properly exercised her investigative discretion in not providing you with copies of the memos.

5. Failing to Respond to Your September 10, 2012 Letter

On page 5 of your December 4, 2012 letter, you list 7 items from your September 10, 2012 letter on which Ms Syed did not respond to you. Items 1 through 6 are all matters which will be addressed with you in writing when the investigation is completed. It would be premature to respond to these items while the investigation is ongoing. It is not part of the investigative process for Law Society investigators to engage in an ongoing dialogue with complainants or

licensees about specific items of evidence. An investigator collects, reviews and analyzes evidence. An investigator may direct specific questions to a complainant or licensee but does not comment on the merits of differing views of the evidence while an investigation is ongoing. With respect to item 7, Law Society investigative staff do not provide complainants or other members of the public with legislative materials. The *Rules of Professional Conduct* and other governing legislation are available by following the links at the Law Society website:

<http://www.lsuc.on.ca/with.aspx?id=1068>

6. Failing to Respond to Your September 24, 2012 Letter

Starting on page 5 and continuing onto page 6 of your December 4, 2012 letter, you list 4 items from your September 24, 2012 letter on which Ms Syed did not respond to you.

Items 1 and 2 are matters which will be addressed with you in writing when the investigation is completed. Once again, it would be premature to respond to these items while the investigation is ongoing. With respect to item 3, I do not have anything to add to the comments I made earlier in this letter about the routing of your complaint.

Item 4 is your assertion that Ms Syed failed to acknowledge the significance of a conflict of interest. You also refer to the conflict of interest on page 8 of your letter, stating that Ms Syed has a duty, responsibility, and obligation to investigate the conflict of interest allegation as part of a full, fair, and transparent investigation. In three letters (July 4, 2012, August 22, 2012, and November 23, 2012), Ms Syed indicated to you why the Law Society did not proceed with the allegation of Mr. Ehlers being in a conflict of interest with respect to Derek Widdicks. She explained to you that for an investigation to be conducted pursuant to section 49.3(2) of the *Law Society Act*, there must be evidence raising a reasonable suspicion that the lawyer may have engaged in professional conduct. An investigation was not instructed on the allegation of conflict of interest since the evidence you provided did not satisfy the legislative threshold of reasonable suspicion. I have had another look at the evidence to determine if there is sufficient evidence to request the Director of Professional Regulation of the Law Society to instruct a professional conduct investigation on the conflict allegation. I have concluded that there is no evidence to support a request for an investigation on this issue pursuant to s.49.3(2) of the *Law Society Act*.

6. Failing to Respond to Your November 12, 2012 Letter

Starting on page 6 of your December 4, 2012 letter, you list 3 items from your November 12, 2012 letter on which Ms Syed did not respond to you. Items 1 and 2 are matters which will be addressed with you in writing when the investigation is completed. Once again, it would be premature to respond to these items while the investigation is ongoing. Item 3 in which you state that Ms Syed failed to respond about your intention to forward copies of your additional assessments and analysis of your disclosure did not require a response from Ms Syed. In your November 12, 2012 letter, you state that you documented further issues and that it is imperative

licensees about specific items of evidence. An investigator collects, reviews and analyzes evidence. An investigator may direct specific questions to a complainant or licensee but does not comment on the merits of differing views of the evidence while an investigation is ongoing. With respect to item 7, Law Society investigative staff do not provide complainants or other members of the public with legislative materials. The *Rules of Professional Conduct* and other governing legislation are available by following the links at the Law Society website:

<http://www.lsuc.on.ca/with.aspx?id=1068>

6. Failing to Respond to Your September 24, 2012 Letter

Starting on page 5 and continuing onto page 6 of your December 4, 2012 letter, you list 4 items from your September 24, 2012 letter on which Ms Syed did not respond to you.

Items 1 and 2 are matters which will be addressed with you in writing when the investigation is completed. Once again, it would be premature to respond to these items while the investigation is ongoing. With respect to item 3, I do not have anything to add to the comments I made earlier in this letter about the routing of your complaint.

Item 4 is your assertion that Ms Syed failed to acknowledge the significance of a conflict of interest. You also refer to the conflict of interest on page 8 of your letter, stating that Ms Syed has a duty, responsibility, and obligation to investigate the conflict of interest allegation as part of a full, fair, and transparent investigation. In three letters (July 4, 2012, August 22, 2012, and November 23, 2012), Ms Syed indicated to you why the Law Society did not proceed with the allegation of Mr. Ehlers being in a conflict of interest with respect to Derek Widdicks. She explained to you that for an investigation to be conducted pursuant to section 49.3(2) of the *Law Society Act*, there must be evidence raising a reasonable suspicion that the lawyer may have engaged in professional conduct. An investigation was not instructed on the allegation of conflict of interest since the evidence you provided did not satisfy the legislative threshold of reasonable suspicion. I have had another look at the evidence to determine if there is sufficient evidence to request the Director of Professional Regulation of the Law Society to instruct a professional conduct investigation on the conflict allegation. I have concluded that there is no evidence to support a request for an investigation on this issue pursuant to s.49.3(2) of the *Law Society Act*.

6. Failing to Respond to Your November 12, 2012 Letter

Starting on page 6 of your December 4, 2012 letter, you list 3 items from your November 12, 2012 letter on which Ms Syed did not respond to you. Items 1 and 2 are matters which will be addressed with you in writing when the investigation is completed. Once again, it would be premature to respond to these items while the investigation is ongoing. Item 3 in which you state that Ms Syed failed to respond about your intention to forward copies of your additional assessments and analysis of your disclosure did not require a response from Ms Syed. In your November 12, 2012 letter, you state that you documented further issues and that it is imperative

for you to forward a copy of your assessment and analysis. Since you indicated you would be forwarding something to Ms Syed, a response from her was not required unless and until she received your additional material.

7. Transcripts

Ms Syed, in her November 23, 2012 letter to you, indicated that you may provide transcripts of the proceedings as the Law Society will not be requesting them. In response, you state: "*You have an obligation to order all certified court transcripts as it is related to this matter as part of a full, fair and transparent investigation. If you do not order these transcripts this will just further display that you are terrified and petrified of the truth surfacing and this is just another attempt to cover-up for Mr. Ehlers.*"

In any investigation, the investigator must exercise discretion to determine what evidence (including transcripts) is required to complete an investigation of the relevant issues. In this matter Ms Syed exercised that discretion and determined that she does not have to obtain the transcripts at this time to continue her investigation of the professional regulation issues. If, as the investigation continues, she determines that a valid investigative purpose would be served by obtaining and reviewing all or part of the transcripts, she may reconsider her decision.

I now want to turn to your January 7, 2013 letter.

1. Routing and Assignment of the Investigation

Please see my comments above in numbered section 3. This investigation will neither be transferred to another department nor reassigned to another investigator.

2. Management of Investigations

Investigations are not managed on a day-to-day basis at the level described in your letter. All investigators are trained in Law Society policies, procedures and practices. Subject to general managerial oversight (for example, as reflected in my review of this investigation) and guidance, investigators have a significant level of independence as they apply their experience, skills, and professional judgment to make investigative decisions in the matters assigned to them. Ms Syed is an experienced lawyer and investigator and I assigned this matter to her because I was, and continue to be, confident that she has the necessary training, skills and experience to investigate the regulatory issues identified in your complaint.


3. Professional Conduct of Ms Syed

As Ms Syed explained in her December 19, 2012 letter to you, professional conduct complaints against Law Society staff are reviewed and considered by Zeynep Onen, Director of Professional Regulation. You were given the opportunity to submit a Complaint Form. However, in your January 7, 2013 letter to me you indicate that your: "*complaints about the professional conduct of Ms. Syed ... are accurately identified in my letter dated the 04-12-12.*" Therefore, I will pass on to Ms Onen for her consideration your December 4, 2012 letter along with the investigation file. I expect that you will hear from her directly after she has reviewed the matter.

Your January 7, 2013 letter and the attached Complaint Form will be considered as part of this investigation.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to respond to your concerns.

Yours very truly,



A. Hershel Gross
Manager
Complaints Resolution

AHG/lss

cc: Zeynep Onen, Director, Professional Regulation
Chandi Syed, Complaints Resolution Counsel



The Law Society of
Upper Canada

Barreau
du Haut-Canada

January 24, 2013

Private & Confidential

Mr. Derek Dunlop
North Bay Jail
2550 Trout Lake Road
North Bay, Ontario L9M 2N4

Dear Mr. Dunlop:

Re: My January 16, 2013 Letter to You

I have received information that you can now be reached at the above address. On January 16, 2013 I sent a 7 page letter to you at your former address. Did you receive that letter? If not, may I send a copy of the January 16, 2013 letter to you at the North Bay address or another address you specify?

Yours very truly,

A. Hershel Gross
Manager
Complaints Resolution

AHG /

Osgoode Hall
130 Queen Street West
Toronto, Ontario
M5H 2N6

Tel: (416)947-3388
Fax: (416)947-5256

Complaints Resolution
Department
Professional Regulation

A. Hershel Gross
Manager
Complaints Resolution

hgross@lsuc.on.ca



The Law Society of
Upper Canada | Barreau
du Haut-Canada

January 29, 2013

Private & Confidential

Derek Dunlop
North Bay Jail
2550 Trout Lake Road
North Bay, Ontario L9M 2N4

Dear Mr. Dunlop:

Re: Lawyer: Eginhart Ehlers
Complainant: Derek Dunlop
Case No. 2012-106759

Osgoode Hall
130 Queen Street West
Toronto, Ontario
M5H 2N6

Tel: (416)947-5215
Fax: (416)947-5256

Complaints Resolution Department
Professional Regulation

Chandi Syed
Complaints Resolution Counsel

csved@lsuc.on.ca

Further to our telephone conversation on January 28, 2013, please find enclosed two Complaint Forms as requested by you.

Yours very truly,

Chandi Syed
Complaints Resolution Counsel

Enclosures:

1. 2 Complaint Forms – 10 pages

mae

15-MAR-13

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,
THE LAW SOCIETY OF UPPER CANADA
130 QUEEN STREET WEST
TORONTO, ONTARIO M5H 2N6

RE: LAWYER: EGINHART ENLERS
COMPLAINANT: DEREK DUNLOP
CASE NO.: 2012-106759

SUBJECT: SUBSEQUENT COMPLAINTS IN ACCORDANCE TO THE MISCONDUCT, BEHAVIORS AND
ACTIONS OF MS. CHANDI SYED AND MR. A. HERSCHER GROSS

DEAR

I AM WRITING TO YOU TO RESPOND TO THE CONCERNS, ISSUES AND COMPLAINTS THAT I
POSSESS IN ACCORDANCE TO THE ACTIONS AND RESPONSES OF MR. A. HERSCHER GROSS THAT
HE HAS PROVIDED TO ME IN HIS "PREDICTABLE" LETTER DATED THE 16-JAN-13. I MEAN PREDICTABLE
IN THE SENSE THAT MR. GROSS OBVIOUSLY HAS NOT FOUND 1 FAULT OF MS. SYED. MOREOVER,
THIS POSITION WOULD TRANSCEND ITSELF TO THE FACT(S) THAT MS. SYED NOR MR. GROSS WILL
FIND ANY FAULT IN THE ABUNDANCE OF IMPROPRIETIES, TRANSGRESSIONS, COVER-UPS, LIES,
FALSIFICATIONS, FABRICATIONS, WRONGDOINGS, ILLEGAL ACTIONS, COLLUSION AND INDISCRETIONS
THAT MR. ENLERS HAS INTENTIONALLY AND PURPOSELY ENGAGED HIMSELF IN. MORE SPECIFICALLY,
IT IS HIGHLY EVIDENT THAT MR. GROSS IS GOING TO SUPPORT MS. SYED IN EACH AND EVERY
FACET OF THE INVESTIGATION SHE IS CONDUCTING IN REGARD TO MR. ENLERS AS MR. GROSS
WOULD BE HEAVILY INVOLVED IN THE CASE CONSULTATION AND SUPERVISION OF SAID MATTER.
FURTHERMORE, MR. GROSS IS DEFINITELY NOT GOING TO FIND ANY FAULT IN THE MANNER IN
WHICH MS. SYED HAS CONDUCTED THIS AFOREMENTIONED INVESTIGATION, DUE TO THE FACT THAT
MR. GROSS WOULD ALSO TECHNICALLY BE ATTRIBUTING SOME FAULT IN RELATION TO HIMSELF
AS HE WOULD BE FACILITATING AND PROVIDING CASE DIRECTION RELATED TO THIS MATTER.

mine

-2-

AS I HAVE STATED IN THE PAST, THE INTENTIONAL DISHONEST AND DISHONOURABLE WRONGDOINGS, IMPROPRIETIES AND SHORTCOMINGS OF MR. ENLERS ARE HOLDING ANYBODY WHO BECOMES ASSOCIATED TO THIS MATTER AS A HOSTAGE. IT IS HIGHLY EVIDENT THAT MR. ENLERS DOES NOT POSSESS THE COURAGE TO BE BRAVE ENOUGH TO BE FORTHRIGHT AND COME FORWARD WITH THE TRUTH. INSTEAD, MR. ENLERS WOULD RATHER RESORT TO SUCH DEGRADATE MEASURES AS COMPRISING A 6-PAGE LETTER LITTERED WITH NUMEROUS FRAUDULENT COVER-UPS, MISREPRESENTATIONS, OUTRIGHT LIES, FABULATIONS AND PALSIFICATIONS. MOREOVER, THE ACTIONS OF MRS. SYED IN CONJUNCTION WITH OTHER LAW SOCIETY STAFF AND LAW SOCIETY REGULATIONS ARE CONDUCTIVE TO A PRE-CALCULATED INVESTIGATION DESIGNED TO PURPOSELY COVER-UP FOR MR. ENLERS. MRS. SYED HAS HAD TO ABUSE HER RESPECTIVE POWERS AND OPPORTUNITIES IN ORDER TO DO SO, NOT TO MENTION THE FACT THAT MRS. SYED HAS USED AND ABUSED LAW SOCIETY REGULATIONS, POLICIES, PROCESSES, STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES IN ORDER TO ACHIEVE THIS PRE-MEDITATED GOAL. I AM NOT SAYING THAT MRS. SYED HAS TOTALLY ENGAGED HERSELF IN THESE INAPPROPRIATE AND IMPROPER BEHAVIORS SOLELY ON HER OWN ACCORD AND VOLITION. IT IS EVIDENT THAT MRS. SYED WOULD HAVE BEEN HEAVILY SWAYED AND INFLUENCED BY LAW SOCIETY STAFF WITH A SENIOR POSITION WITH YOUR ORGANIZATION. I CAN ALMOST STATE WITH NO UNCERTAINTY THAT MRS. SYED WOULD HAVE "SECOND GUESSED" AND PROBABLY "TRIPLED GUESSED" THE DECISIONS BEING MADE AT EACH AND EVERY TURN OF THE INVESTIGATION IN ACCORDANCE TO MR. ENLERS. IT IS ALSO HIGHLY EVIDENT THAT MRS. SYED IS NOT BRAVE ENOUGH TO ADMIT TO ANY OF HER INVOLVEMENT IN THESE ON-GOING COVER-UPS. IN ADDITION, MR. A. HENSEL GROSS HAS NOW INVOLVED HIMSELF IN THE ON-GOING COVER-UPS AS A RESULT OF THE CONTENTS OF HIS LETTER DATED THE 16-JAN-13. MR. GROSS OBVIOUSLY HAS A VESTED INTEREST IN SUPPORTING AND COVERING UP FOR MRS. SYED. FINALLY, IT IS ALSO HIGHLY EVIDENT THAT MR. GROSS DOES NOT HAVE THE COURAGE TO ADMIT TO ANY IMPROPRIETIES, TRANSGRESSIONS, WRONGDOINGS, MISCONDUCT AND INDISCRETIONS COMMITTED BY MRS. SYED, MR. ENLERS AND/OR BY HIMSELF.

AT THIS TIME, I AM GOING TO RESPECTFULLY RECOMMEND AND SUGGEST THAT AS A RESULT OF THE NOTED COMPLAINTS FILED IN RELATION TO MRS. SYED AND MR. GROSS THAT THERE WOULD BE A FORESEEABLE CONFLICT OF INTEREST THAT WOULD POSSIBLY BE ACCOMPANIED BY

↳

ADDITIONAL BIASES, PREJUDICES AND DISCRIMINATIONS IF MS. SYED AND/OR MR. GROSS WERE FORWARDED THIS DOCUMENTATION. MORE SPECIFICALLY, I AM GOING TO RESPECTFULLY SUBMIT THAT AT THIS TIME AN INDEPENDENT GOVERNING BODY AND/OR ANOTHER OUTSIDE PRIVATE AGENCY INDEPENDENT FROM THE LAW SOCIETY OF UPPER CANADA BE REQUESTED TO DILIGENTLY CONDUCT AN IMPARTIAL, FULL, TRANSPARENT, EXTENSIVE, COMPREHENSIVE, THOROUGH, SUFFICIENT, UNBIASED, LEGITIMATE, PRACTICAL, PROFESSIONAL, REALISTIC, HONEST, FAIR AND NON-INFLUENTIAL INVESTIGATION.

IT IS OBVIOUS THAT IF NOBODY EMPLOYED IN THESE PROMINENT AND DISTINGUISHED POSITIONS IN OUR SOCIETY ARE WILLING TO BE STRAIGHTFORWARD AND ADMIT TO THEIR RESPECTIVE AND COLLECTIVE WRONGDOINGS, ILLEGAL ACTIONS, ABUSE OF POWERS AND AUTHORITIES, MISCONDUCT, ABUSE OF THE LAWS AND REGULATIONS, FABRICATIONS, PALSIFICATIONS, MISREPRESENTATIONS AND LIES THAT THERE IS ABSOLUTELY NOTHING I AM (OR ANYBODY IN A SIMILAR POSITION) IS ABLE TO DO ABOUT IT. THE MOST CALLOUS, MALICIOUS, REMEMENSIBLE, PATHETIC, INEXPLICABLE, INEXCUSABLE, REVOLTING, DISGUSTING, OUTLANDISH, SCANDALOUS, NEPHEWIS AND COWARDLY BEHAVIORS AND ACTIONS OF PEOPLE SUCH AS MR. ENLERS, MS. SYED AND MR. GROSS IS THEY KNOW FULL WELL THAT THEY ARE IN THE WRONG AT EACH AND EVERY STAGE OF THE INVESTIGATION, HOWEVER, THEY MUST BELIEVE THAT THEY ARE DOING NOTHING WRONG. FURTHERMORE, THEY MUST FEEL THAT THEY ARE IMPERVIOUS TO ANY OF THE CONSEQUENCES, RAMIFICATIONS, SANCTIONS AND PUNISHMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH THEIR JOINT AND COLLECTIVE INAPPROPRIATE AND IMPROPER ACTIONS.

NEXT, I AM GOING TO BREAKDOWN AND DISSECT THE CONTENTS OF MR. A. HENSON GROSS' LETTER DATED THE 16-JAN-13.

FIRST, PAGE #1, PARAGRAPH #2 (MR. GROSS' LETTER-16-JAN-13), MR. GROSS STATES THAT MY COMPLAINT WAS PROPERLY ROUTED TO THE COMPLAINTS RESOLUTION DEPARTMENT FOR INVESTIGATION. OF COURSE, MR. GROSS IS GOING TO SAY THIS. PLEASE KEEP IN MIND THAT UPON THE INITIAL SUBMISSION OF MY LETTER DATED THE 22-MAR-12, THAT AT NO TIME DID ANY MEMBER/EMPLOYEE OF THE LAW SOCIETY REQUEST THAT I FOLLOW PROCESS AND COMPLETE A COMPLAINTS FORM.

NAME

-4-

MOREOVER, I WOULD HAVE TO BELIEVE THAT THIS WOULD HAVE HAD TO BE A STANDARD PROCESS. SECOND, I AM OF THE FIRM BELIEF THAT THIS COMPLAINT SHOULD HAVE ORIGINALLY BEEN TRANSMITTED TO YOUR INVESTIGATIONS DEPARTMENT TO BE HANDLED BY AN EXPERIENCED INVESTIGATOR. I HAVE BEEN PROVIDED WITH VIRTUALLY NO ADEQUATE REASONS TO SUGGEST OTHERWISE. FROM SOME OF THE LIMITED INFORMATION ABOUT THE PROCESSES OF THE LAW SOCIETY THAT I DO POSSESS, IT DEFINITELY APPEARS THAT MEMBERS OF THE LAW SOCIETY HAD A PRE-DETERMINED PLAN TO PURPOSELY ASSIGN MY COMPLAINTS IN ACCORDANCE TO MR. KELLERS TO THE CONFLICT RESOLUTION DEPARTMENT. FURTHERMORE, THIS PRE-PLANNED INITIATIVE MAY HAVE BEEN DEVISED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT EASIER FOR MEMBERS OF THE LAW SOCIETY TO CONDUCT THIS TYPE OF INVESTIGATION IN WHICH THEY WOULD HAVE BASICALLY COMPLETE AUTONOMY AND CONTROL. ADDITIONALLY THE LAW SOCIETY MAY HAVE DEVELOPED NUMEROUS BIASES, PREJUDICES AND DISCRIMINATIONS AGAINST ME DUE TO THE FACTS THAT I FILED AN ABUNDANCE OF COMPLAINTS IN RELATION TO MR. STEVEN R. SAGER IN WHICH I SUBSEQUENTLY HAVE PUBLICLY RAISED ISSUES IN THE MANNER THAT MR. ADAM GREENAWAY CONDUCTED THE AFOREMENTIONED INVESTIGATION. AT THIS POINT, I AM STILL OF THE FIRM BELIEF THAT THIS INVESTIGATION NEEDS TO BE TRANSMITTED TO YOUR INVESTIGATIONS DEPARTMENT. IN ADDITION, I WOULD GREATLY APPRECIATE IT IF I COULD BE PROVIDED A COPY OF THE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES REFERENCING AND OUTLINING THE DISTINGUISHABLE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PROCESSES AND STANDARDS OF AN INVESTIGATION COMPLETED BY YOUR COMPLAINTS RESOLUTION DEPARTMENT AND AN INVESTIGATION CONDUCTED BY YOUR INVESTIGATION'S UNIT. I POSSESS THE IMPRESSION THAT YOUR CONFLICT RESOLUTIONS DEPT. IS MORE OF A MEDIATOR TYPE OF PROCESS. FINALLY, MR. GROSS' STATEMENT IS AMBIGUOUS IN NATURE AND HE PROVIDES NO CONTEXT, NO INFORMATION AND NO EVIDENCE TO SUBSTANTIATE AND VALIDATE HIS CLAIM THAT MY COMPLAINT WAS PROPERLY ROUTED. IT SIMPLY IS A MATTER OF FACT ASSERTION ON MR. GROSS' PART WITH ABSOLUTELY NO SUPPORT. ALSO, LET ME PLEASE STATE THAT MR. GROSS RESORTS TO THESE TYPES OF STATEMENTS FREQUENTLY THROUGHOUT THE CONTENTS OF HIS LETTER DATED THE 16-JAN-13. IN PARAGRAPH #2, PAGE #1, MR. GROSS STATES THAT HE IS SATISFIED THAT MS. SYED IS CONDUCTING THE INVESTIGATION OF THE INSTATED ALLEGATIONS IN AN APPROPRIATE WAY, THEREFORE, THERE IS NO REASON TO REASSIGN THE INVESTIGATION AND MS. SYED WILL CONTINUE AND COMPLETE THIS INVESTIGATION.

<

NINE

- 5 -

OF COURSE, MR. GROSS IS GOING TO STATE THIS BECAUSE HE WOULD BE HEAVILY INVOLVED IN THE INVESTIGATION'S DIRECTION AND CONSULTATION. ONCE AGAIN, MR. GROSS DOES NOT PROVIDE ANY REASONS AND/OR SUPPORT ABOUT WHY HE IS SATISFIED THAT MS. SYED IS CONDUCTING THE INVESTIGATION OF THE INSTRUCTED ALLEGATIONS IN AN APPROPRIATE WAY.

NEXT, I WILL ADDRESS THE DELAY IN RESPONDING TO MY LETTER DATED THE 10-SEP-12. THERE ARE REASONS WHY THIS TRANSPIRED THAT MS. SYED, MR. GROSS AND THE LAW SOCIETY WILL BE UNWILLING TO ADMIT TO. I AM CERTAIN THAT YOUR EMPLOYEES WILL BE UNWILLING TO ADMIT TO YOUR ON-GOING PRE-PLANNED SCHEMES TO COVER-UP FOR MR. ENLERS BUT THE DELAY WOULD HAVE BEEN CONNECTED TO CREATING AND DEVELOPING STRATEGIES IN ORDER TO DO SO. IT IS EVIDENT THAT THE MEMBERS OF THE LAW SOCIETY WILL CONTINUE TO COVER THIS UP AS MR. GROSS HAS CONTINUED TO DO IN HIS LETTER DATED THE 16-JAN-15.

I WILL NOW REFERENCE THE HIGHLY IMPORTANT ISSUES OF MS. SYED PURPOSELY FORWARDING MY CONTEMPORANEOUSLY DOCUMENTED CASE NOTES PRIOR TO NOTIFYING ME THAT SHE WAS GOING TO SEND MR. ENLERS THESE PRIVILEGED NOTATIONS. IT WAS NOT UNTIL AFTER THE FACT THAT MS. SYED INFORMED ME THAT SHE HAD SHARED THESE PRIVATE CORRESPONDENCES WITH MR. ENLERS. MR. GROSS NEVER ADDRESSES THE AFOREMENTIONED FACTORS IN HIS LETTER DATED THE 16-JAN-15 BECAUSE HE IS TERRIFIED AND RETRIFIED TO ADMIT TO THESE FACTS. MR. GROSS IS UNWILLING TO HOLD MS. SYED ACCOUNTABLE AND RESPONSIBLE FOR HER WRONGDOINGS IN ACCORDANCE TO THESE COMPLAINTS AS MR. GROSS HIMSELF WOULD ALSO HAVE TO TAKE OWNERSHIP FOR THESE INAPPROPRIETIES DUE TO HIS DIRECT ASSOCIATION TO THIS CASE. OF COURSE MR. GROSS AGREES WITH THE APPROACH TAKEN BY MS. SYED AND MR. GROSS DOES NOT AGREE WITH MY ASSERTION THAT SHE WAS MOTIVATED BY SOME IMPROPER PURPOSE. AS I HAVE NOTED PREVIOUSLY, I SUBMITTED A LETTER TO THE LAW SOCIETY DATED THE 22-MAR-12 BUT NO EMPLOYEE OF YOUR ORGANIZATION EVER REQUESTED ME TO COMPLETE A COMPLAINT FORM. I HAVE MADE MY CONCERNS ABUNDANTLY CLEAR ABOUT HOW THE LAW SOCIETY DEvised A PLAN TO VIRTUALLY ENTRAP ME INTO SIGNING AN ACKNOWLEDGEMENT AND CONSENT FORM AS PART OF MS. SYED'S AND OTHERS PRE-MEDITATED PLAN TO BASICALLY ISSUE AN ULTIMATUM. THIS IS DISGUSTING ON EVERY SINGLE LEVEL IMAGINABLE AND MS. SYED, MR. GROSS AND OTHERS KNOW IT BUT THEY

| <

WILL NEVER BE FORTHRIGHT AND COME FORWARD WITH THE TRUTH. AFTER I BLATANTLY EXPRESSED THAT I DID NOT WANT THE LAW SOCIETY TO FORWARD ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTATION TO MR. ENLERS, MR. GROSS STATES THAT HE WOULD HAVE TO ASSUME SHARING DOCUMENTS WITH MR. ENLERS IS NO LONGER AN ISSUE. THIS IS JUST ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF THE UNDERHAND SCHEMES EMPLOYED BY THE LAW SOCIETY TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE ON-GOING COVER-UPS. ADDITIONALLY, MR. GROSS SHOULD NOT MAKE ASSUMPTIONS THAT ARE ENTIRELY ADVANTAGEOUS TO MR. ENLERS, MRS. SYED, HIMSELF AND YOUR AGENCY.

NEXT, I WILL REFER TO THE FACT THAT MRS. SYED IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE LAW SOCIETY WILL INTENTIONALLY FORBID ME TO POSSESS COPIES OF MR. ENLERS'S FILE MEMOS. OF COURSE, MRS. SYED IS NOT GOING TO PROVIDE ME COPIES OF MR. ENLERS'S MEMOS. AS I HAVE STATED BEFORE ANY COMPLAINANT (INCLUDING MYSELF) SHOULD BE PROVIDED FULL DISCLOSURE OF THE LICENSEE'S RESPONSES AS PART OF A FULL, FAIR, TRANSPARENT, UNBIASED, IMPARTIAL, HONEST, LEGITIMATE AND VALID INVESTIGATION. FURTHERMORE, I HAVE ALSO PREVIOUSLY INDICATED THAT THE UNRESTRICTED ACCESS TO OR COPIES OF MATERIALS FROM AN INVESTIGATIVE FILE SHOULD BE IN ACCORDANCE TO THE PRIVATE MODULES, PAPERWORK AND CASE NOTES COMPLETED BY THE LAW SOCIETY STAFF NOT THE MEMOS OR OTHER INFORMATION PROVIDED BY THE LAWYER. YOUR AGENCY HAD NO PROBLEMS WITH SUPPLYING ME WITH MR. ENLERS'S 6-PAGE LETTER, SO THERE SHOULD BE NO ISSUES WITH FORWARDING ME MR. ENLERS'S ^{MEMOS} UNLESS OF COURSE MEMBERS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION ARE INVOLVED WITH COVERING UP FOR MR. ENLERS. MORE SPECIFICALLY, MR. GROSS STATES THAT A REQUEST FROM A COMPLAINANT OF COPIES OF MATERIALS FROM AN INVESTIGATION FILE IN OF ITSELF IS NOT A VALID INVESTIGATIVE PURPOSE FOR SHARING EVIDENCE. ONCE AGAIN, MR. GROSS ESTABLISHES NO CONTEXT, NO SUBSTANCE, NO SUPPORT AND NO REASONS TO VALIDATE THIS STATEMENT. OF COURSE, MR. GROSS PROCEEDS TO STATE THAT HE IS SATISFIED MRS. SYED PROPERLY EXERCISED HER INVESTIGATIVE DISCRETION IN NOT PROVIDING YOU WITH COPIES OF THE MEMOS. ONCE AGAIN, MR. GROSS PROVIDES NO FACTUAL SUPPORT IN CONNECTION TO HIS ASSERTION. PROCEEDED, THESE ACTIONS AND BEHAVIORS OF BOTH MRS. SYED AND MR. GROSS JUST FURTHER REVEAL THE MULTIPLICITY OF BIASES, PREJUDICES AND DISCRIMINATIONS THAT CONTINUE TO GROW AGAINST MYSELF. FINALLY, THE FACT THAT THE LAW SOCIETY IS PRECLUDING AND PREVENTING ME FROM HAVING ACCESS TO SAID MEMOS OF MR. ENLERS IS A DOUBLE STANDARD AND IS EXTREMELY SUSPICIOUS ON THE PART OF YOUR AGENCY.

IN RELATION TO MR. GROSS RESPONDING TO MY CONCERNS ABOUT FAILING TO RESPOND TO MY LETTER DATED THE 10-SEP-02, MR. GROSS PROVIDES SOME CONDESCENDING AND DISPARAGING COMMENTS. FIRST, MR. GROSS KNOWS FULL WELL THAT I AM CURRENTLY IN CUSTODY AND I DO NOT HAVE ACCESS TO LEGISLATIVE MATERIALS AND THUS I MADE MY REQUEST ACCORDINGLY. MR. GROSS OBVIOUSLY DOES NOT WANT TO COOPERATE BY ASSISTING ME WITH ACQUIRING THE NECESSARY LEGISLATION I REQUIRE IN ORDER TO MAKE THIS A FAIR, JUST, PROPER, FULL, COMPREHENSIVE, THOROUGH, EXTENSIVE AND TRANSPARENT INVESTIGATION. MOREOVER, MR. GROSS DOES NOT WANT TO ASSIST ME AND/OR ESTABLISH ANY PRECEDENCE THAT SHOULD BE IN PLACE IN THE FIRST PLACE. MORE SPECIFICALLY, MR. GROSS THEN EVEN HAS THE GALL AND AUDACITY TO PROVIDE ME THE LAW SOCIETY WEBSITE LINK FOR THE RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT @ <http://www.lsuc.on.ca/with.aspx?id=1068> KNOWING FULL WELL I AM IN CUSTODY AND I AM UNABLE TO ACCESS A COMPUTER LET ALONE A WEBSITE. HOWEVER, THIS IS WHAT HAPPENS WHEN YOU ARE DILIGENTLY INVOLVED IN COVER-UPS AS MR. GROSS IS ENGAGED IN.

NEXT, I WILL ADDRESS THE CONFLICT OF INTEREST ASPECT OF THE INVESTIGATION. AS I HAVE STATED TO MEMBERS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION ON NUMEROUS PREVIOUS OCCASIONS THERE IS RELEVANT, ADEQUATE, SUFFICIENT AND SIGNIFICANT EVIDENCE TO FOLLOW UP ON THE CONFLICT OF INTEREST FACET OF THE INVESTIGATION. THERE IS MORE THAN A REASONABLE SUSPICION THAT WOULD FAR EXCEED THE THRESHOLD OF REASONABLE SUSPICION, FOR MR. GROSS, MRS. STEE AND THE LAW SOCIETY TO SUGGEST OTHERWISE, THAT THERE IS NOT REASONABLE SUSPICION IS ABSOLUTELY OUTRAGEOUS, OUTLANDISH AND ABSURD. I DID NOT JUST PULL THIS INFORMATION OUT OF "THIN AIR" ABOUT MR. ENLERS POSSESSING A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AS IT RELATES TO MR. DEREK WIDDICKS OF SIMCOE C.A.S. THE TRUTH IS THAT, THERE IS MORE THAN A REASONABLE SUSPICION AND THE LAW SOCIETY IS TERRIFIED AND PETRIFIED TO INITIATE THE FIRST STEP OF CONTACTING THE SIMCOE C.A.S., IN ORDER TO DETERMINE WHAT INVOLVEMENT MR. ENLERS HAS HAD WITH MR. DEREK WIDDICKS AND SIMCOE C.A.S. CLIENTS. THE LAW SOCIETY IS NEGLECTING AND IGNORING YOUR RESPONSIBILITIES BY NOT FOLLOWING UP ON THIS PART OF THE INVESTIGATION. TO ATTEMPT TO INTENTIONALLY HIDE BEHIND AN EXTREMELY AMBIGUOUS STATEMENT IN SECTION 49.3(2) OF THE LAW SOCIETY ACT IS CALLOUS AND CONSIDERABLY IT ALSO FURTHER DISPLAYS AND BENEFITS THAT YOUR AGENCY IS UNABLE TO CONDUCT AN IMPARTIAL AND UNBIASED INVESTIGATION. ONCE AGAIN,

I WILL RESPECTFULLY REQUEST THAT THE LAW SOCIETY RE-OPEN THIS ASPECT OF THE INVESTIGATION. MR. GROSS STATES THAT HE HAD ANOTHER LOOK AT THE EVIDENCE TO DETERMINE IF THERE IS SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE TO REQUEST THE DIRECTOR OF PROFESSIONAL REGULATION OF THE LAW SOCIETY TO INSTRUCT A PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT INVESTIGATION ON THE CONFLICT ALLEGATION. MR. GROSS PROCEEDS BY STATING THAT THERE IS NO EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT A REQUEST FOR AN INVESTIGATION ON THIS ISSUE PURSUANT TO S. 49.3(2) OF THE LAW SOCIETY ACT. FOR MR. GROSS TO SUGGEST THAT THERE IS NO EVIDENCE IS CALLOUS ON ITS OWN BECAUSE MR. GROSS KNOWS THERE IS EVIDENCE HE JUST DOES NOT WANT TO PROCEED DOWN THAT PATH OF THE INVESTIGATION FEELING OF WHAT IT WILL UNVEIL AND REVEAL.

AT THIS POINT, I WILL RESPOND TO MR. GROSS' COMMENTS ABOUT FAILING TO RESPOND TO MY 12-NOV-12 LETTER. ONCE AGAIN, MR. GROSS STATES THAT A RESPONSE FROM MS. SYED WAS NOT REQUIRED UNLESS AND UNTIL SHE RECEIVED YOUR ADDITIONAL MATERIAL. FIRST, FOR MR. GROSS TO STATE THIS IS AN OPINION AND NOT FACTUAL. I TRULY BELIEVE THAT MS. SYED SHOULD HAVE AT THE VERY LEAST PROVIDED SOME ACKNOWLEDGEMENT AND/OR QUERIES. I WILL FORWARD THE LAW SOCIETY ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS AND ASSESSMENT OF MY DISCLOSURE.

NEXT, I WILL ADDRESS THE ISSUES OF CERTIFIED COURT TRANSCRIPTS. I WILL RE-ITERATE THAT FOR MR. GROSS TO STATE THAT MS. SYED HAS EXERCISED HER DISCRETION AND DETERMINED SHE DOES NOT HAVE TO OBTAIN THE TRANSCRIPTS AT THIS TIME IS JUST ANOTHER ON-GOING PART OF THE COVER-UPS. MS. SYED, MR. GROSS AND OTHER MEMBERS OF THE LAW SOCIETY KNOW FULL WELL THAT ACQUIRING THESE CERTIFIED COURT TRANSCRIPTS RELATED TO MY MATTER WOULD BE VERY DAMAGING EVIDENCE TO MR. ENLORS. THIS IS THE PRIMARY REASON WHY MS. SYED AND OTHERS OF THE LAW SOCIETY WOULD BE UNWILLING TO OBTAIN THE OFFICIAL CERTIFIED COURT TRANSCRIPTS. ONCE AGAIN, I AM GOING TO POLITELY ASK AND RESPECTFULLY SUBMIT THAT YOUR ORGANIZATION DILIGENTLY ACQUIRE SAID CERTIFIED COURT TRANSCRIPTS AS PART OF A VALID, LEGITIMATE, HONEST, GENUINE, PROFESSIONAL, IMPARTIAL AND UNBIASED INVESTIGATION. ANYTHING LESS THAN THIS WILL BE UNCIVILIZED AND NOT IN THE PUBLIC'S BEST INTERESTS. FURTHERMORE, OF COURSE MS. SYED DETERMINED THAT SHE DOES NOT HAVE TO OBTAIN THE TRANSCRIPTS.

I WILL NOW TURN TO THE MANAGEMENT OF INVESTIGATIONS FACET OF MR. GROSS' LETTER DATED

THE 16-JAN-13. WITHOUT POSSESSING THE APPROPRIATE KNOWLEDGE IN ACCORDANCE TO THE CREDENTIALS, SKILLS, TRAINING, WORK EXPERIENCE AND EDUCATION THAT MS. SYED HAS ACCUMULATED, I WOULD HAVE TO SUGGEST THAT THE LAW SOCIETY WOULD HAVE HAD TO CONDUCT A THOROUGH AND COMPREHENSIVE BACKGROUND SCREENING OF MS. SYED'S PAST HISTORY PRIOR TO HIRING MS. SYED FOR THE CURRENT POSITION OF EMPLOY SHE OCCUPIES. THIS IS CURRENTLY OF NO CONSEQUENCE AND NO ISSUE AT THIS TIME AS MR. GROSS ALLEGES TO IN THE CONTENTS OF HIS LETTER. THERE ARE A SUBSTANTIAL NUMBER OF COMPLAINTS IN REGARD TO THE INAPPROPRIATE, IMPROPER, UNJUST, UNFAIR, UNETHICAL, PARTIAL, BIASED, PREJUDICIAL, DISCRIMINATORY, ABUSE OF POWERS, ABUSE OF DUE PROCESS, MANIPULATION OF LAW SOCIETY POLICIES AND REGULATIONS, COVER-UPS AND OTHER SERIOUS CONCERNS IN REGARD TO THE MANNERS IN WHICH MS. SYED HAS CONDUCTED THE INVESTIGATION. SO FOR MR. GROSS TO CLAIM THAT HE IS CONFIDENT THAT MS. SYED HAS THE NECESSARY TRAINING, SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE TO INVESTIGATE THE REGULATORY ISSUES IS A POINT AND BASICALLY AT THIS TIME IS IRRELEVANT TO THE CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING MY COMPLAINTS. ONCE AGAIN, OF COURSE MR. GROSS WILL SUPPORT MS. SYED BECAUSE HE WOULD ALSO BE SETTING HIMSELF OUT IF HE ADMITS THAT SHE IS IN THE WRONG ON ONE OR MORE OCCASIONS.

NOW I WILL PROFOUNDLY RE-ITERATE FOR THE RECORD THAT I ABSOLUTELY HAVE NO REASON TO LIE ABOUT THE ACTIONS OF MR. EGINHART ENLERS. FURTHERMORE, IT IS DISTINCTLY EVIDENT THAT MR. ENLERS, MS. SYED AND MR. GROSS HAVE NUMEROUS REASONS TO COVER-UP, LIE, FABRICATE, FALSIFY, COLLUDE AND MISREPRESENT EVIDENCE AND INFORMATION IN ORDER TO INTENTIONALLY PROTECT THEIR RESPECTIVE AND COLLECTIVE REPUTATION(S), PROMINENCE, INTEGRITY(IES) AND CREDIBILITY(IES). THESE MENTIONED INDIVIDUALS HAVE A TREMENDOUS AMOUNT TO LOSE SHOULD ANY OF THEM ADMIT TO ANY AND/OR ALL OF THEIR INDEPENDENT AND JOINT INAPPROPRIETIES, WRONGDOINGS AND TRANSGRESSIONS. EACH OF THEM COULD SUFFER SERIOUS REPERCUSSIONS, CONSEQUENCES AND RAMIFICATIONS IF ANY AND/OR ALL OF THE TRUTH SHOULD BE UNCOVERED.

IT SIMPLY DOES NOT MATTER HOW MANY LETTERS I WRITE AND HOW MANY SPECIFICATIONS AND INDICATIONS OF THE MISCONDUCT, ILLEGAL ACTIONS, COVER-UPS, FABRICATIONS, LIES AND COLLUSION THAT I IDENTIFY, IF MR. ENLERS NOR MS. SYED NOR MR. GROSS NOR THE LAW SOCIETY WANT TO ADMIT TO ANYTHING THEY HAVE INDIVIDUALLY AND JOINTLY DONE WRONG, THEN NONE OF THEM EVER WILL.

MINE

-10-

AS I HAVE STATED BEFORE, ^{SOMEONE} SOMEBODY, SOMEWHERE NEEDS TO POSSESS THE MORALS, THE VALUES, THE ETHICS TO BE COURAGEOUS, BRAVE, RESPECTFUL AND HONEST ENOUGH TO BE FORTHRIGHT AND COME FORWARD WITH THE TRUTH, REGARDLESS OF WHAT YOUR EMOTIONS AND FEELINGS ARE TOWARDS ME. THIS IS NOT ACTUALLY ABOUT WHO IS RIGHT OR WHO IS WRONG, THIS IS ABOUT DOING THE RIGHT THING. AT THIS POINT, IT IS HIGHLY EVIDENT THAT NOBODY IS CAPABLE OF ADMITTING TO THE TRUTH. MORE SPECIFICALLY, DISTINGUISHED PEOPLE SUCH AS MR. ENLERS, MRS. SYED AND MR. GROSS ARE COGNIZANT OF THE FACTS OF WHAT THEY ARE DOING IS WRONG BUT THEY ENGAGE IN THEIR INEXPLICABLE, NEPOTISM, SCANDALOUS, RETRIBUTIVE, MALICIOUS AND SUBREPTITIOUS ACTIONS ANYWAYS.

I AM ABLE TO PREDICT THAT THE OUTCOME OF THE LAW SOCIETY'S INVESTIGATION INTO MR. ENLERS WILL DETERMINE THAT MR. ENLERS HAS DONE NOTHING. THIS WILL BE AN ABSOLUTE TRAVESTY. MY 18-PAGE LETTER IDENTIFIES THE WORTH OF INTENTIONAL COVER-UPS, MR. ENLERS HAS HINGED HIMSELF IN, HOWEVER, IT ALREADY APPEARS THAT MRS. SYED WILL PROBABLY NOT USE THIS INFORMATION AND/OR DISMISS IT. IF MRS. SYED DOES USE THE ABOVE NOTED INFORMATION YOU CAN BE REST ASSURED THAT SHE WILL STILL FIND NO FAULT IN MR. ENLERS' ILLEGAL ACTIONS, COVER-UPS, CRIMES, MISCONDUCT AND COLLUSION.

FINALLY, I WILL FACTUALLY IDENTIFY SOME IMPORTANT REASONS WHY IT HAS TAKEN ME A FAIR AMOUNT OF TIME TO FORWARD YOU THIS LETTER. FIRST, I HAVE BEEN TRANSFERRED BACK AND FORTH BETWEEN TWO INSTITUTIONS TO VISIT MY TERMINALLY ILL MOTHER WHO HAS SINCE UNFORTUNATELY PASSED AWAY. NEXT, I AM CURRENTLY IN THE PROCESS OF PREPARING MYSELF FOR A TRIAL WHILE SIMULTANEOUSLY GOING THROUGH THE LOSS OF MY MOTHER. IN ADDITION, I AM ONLY ALLOWED TO SEND OUT TWO LETTERS PER WEEK FROM THESE INSTITUTIONS WHICH HAS ALSO HINDERED ME FROM RESPONDING TO SOME DEGREE. THERE HAS ALSO BEEN A LOT TO DISSECT IN ORDER TO ADEQUATELY OUTLINE MOST OF MY COMPLAINTS AND CONCERNS.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION TO THESE 10-PAGES OF CORRESPONDENCES.

YOURS TRULY,



DEREK DUNLOP

CHANCE NORTH CORRECTIONAL CENTRE - PRISON C.C.
1501 FOLGER AVENUE
PENNINGTON SHIRE, ONTARIO L9M 2H4

