

**FEDERAL COURT**

BETWEEN:

**JOHN C. TURMEL**

Plaintiff  
(Responding Party)

and

**HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN**

Defendant  
(Moving Party)

---

**MOTION RECORD OF THE DEFENDANT**

(Motion to Strike or for Security For Costs)

---

**Attorney General of Canada**

Department of Justice  
Ontario Regional Office  
120 Adelaide Street West, Suite #400  
Toronto, Ontario M5H 1T1

Per: Benjamin Wong

Tel: 647-256-0564  
Fax: 416-952-4518  
E-mail: benjamin.wong2@justice.gc.ca

Counsel for the Defendant

TO: The Administrator  
Federal Court of Canada

AND TO: John C. Turmel  
50 Brant Avenue  
Brantford, Ontario N3T 3G7

Plaintiff, self represented

# INDEX

III

**INDEX**

<b>TAB</b>	<b>DOCUMENT</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
1.	Notice of Motion	1
2.	Statement of Claim	5
3.	Affidavit of Deborah Telesford dated May 20, 2021	50
4.	Written Representations of the Defendant	71

# TAB 1

Court File No.: T-130-21

**FEDERAL COURT**

**BETWEEN :**

**JOHN C. TURMEL**

Plaintiff  
(Responding Party)

and

**HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN**

Defendant  
(Moving Party)

---

**NOTICE OF MOTION**

---

**TAKE NOTICE THAT** the defendant, Her Majesty the Queen (“Canada”) will make a motion to the Court in writing under Rule 369 of the *Federal Courts Rules*.

**THE MOTION IS FOR:**

1. An order striking the claim without leave to amend; or
2. In the alternative, an order requiring the plaintiff to provide security for costs in the amount of \$11,350, and not take any further steps in the action until security for costs is provided;
3. The costs of this motion and of the action; and
4. Such further and other relief as this Honourable Court may allow.

**THE GROUNDS FOR THE MOTION ARE:****A. The claim**

5. The claim seeks declarations that Canada's COVID-19 mitigation measures unjustifiably infringe the plaintiff's rights under ss. 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 12 of the Charter, an order prohibiting any restrictions that are not imposed on the flu, a permanent constitutional exemption from any such restrictions, and damages for pain and losses incurred as a result of the restrictions;

**B. The Federal Court lacks jurisdiction over the claim**

1. The Federal Court lacks jurisdiction to grant the relief requested;
2. The claim alleges that the plaintiff's rights are infringed by "lockdowns & curfews, quarantines, mandatory masks, mandatory social distancing, mandatory vaccine, mandatory immunity card for public services";
3. However, the claim provides no particulars concerning the measures being challenged, and insofar as these measures exist for the general public, they are provincial and municipal measures;
4. While the federal government has adopted targeted COVID-19 mitigation measures in specific contexts, such as the requirement to wear a mask on flights, the claim in question does not allege that the plaintiff was affected by these measures;

**C. The claim does not disclose a reasonable cause of action and is frivolous and vexatious**

5. It is plain and obvious that the claim does not disclose a reasonable cause of action;
6. Insofar as the claim is challenging provincial and municipal measures, there is no reasonable cause of action against Canada;

7. Moreover, even in the event the claim challenges federal measures, the claim does not set out sufficient material facts to establish breaches of ss. 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 12 of the Charter;

**D. The claim is frivolous and vexatious**

8. The claim is it frivolous and vexatious;
9. The claim is prolix and repetitive, and fails to set out a concise statement of material facts capable of establishing a deprivation of any of the Charter infringements alleged;
10. The claim makes unparticularized allegation of malice and fraud;

**E. If the claim is not struck without leave to amend, the Plaintiff should be required to provide security for costs**


11. Canada has six orders against the plaintiff for costs in other proceedings, which remain unpaid;
12. The outstanding costs awards total \$13,003.39, including post-judgment interest;
13. The claim is frivolous and vexatious and there is reason to believe the plaintiff will have insufficient assets available to pay Canada's costs;
14. *Federal Courts Rules*, SOR/98-106, Rules 3, 174, 181, 182, 221, 369, 416(1)(f), 416(1)(g), and 418; and
15. Such other grounds as counsel may advise and this Honourable Court may accept.

**THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE** will be used at the hearing of the motion:



1. Affidavit of Deborah Telesford, affirmed May 21, 2021.

May 21, 2021



---

**Attorney General of Canada**  
Department of Justice  
Ontario Regional Office  
120 Adelaide Street West, Suite #400  
Toronto, Ontario M5H 1T1

Per: Benjamin Wong

Tel: 647-256-0564

Fax: 416-952-4518

E-mail: benjamin.wong2@justice.gc.ca

Counsel for the Defendantt

TO: The Administrator  
Federal Court of Canada

AND TO: John C. Turmel  
50 Brant Avenue,  
Brantford, Ontario N3T 3G7

Plaintiff, self represented

# TAB 2

File No: T-130-21

FEDERAL COURT

Between:

John C. Turmel

e-document		
F I L E D	FEDERAL COURT COUR FÉDÉRALE  19-JAN-2021	D É P O S É
Shirley Aciro		
Toronto, ONT		DOC.1

Plaintiff

AND

Her Majesty The Queen

Defendant

## STATEMENT OF CLAIM

(Pursuant to S.48 of the Federal Court Act)

## 1. Plaintiff seeks:

A) a Declaration pursuant to S.52(1) of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms ("the Charter") that the Government of Canada's ("Canada") Covid-mitigation restrictions are arbitrary and constitutionally unreasonable restrictions on the Charter S.2 right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association, S.6 right to mobility, S.7 right to life, liberty and security, S.8 right to be secure against unreasonable search or seizure, S.9 right to not to be arbitrarily detained or imprisoned, S.12 right to not be subjected to any cruel and unusual treatment or punishment not in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice and not saved by s.1 of the Charter.

B) an Order pursuant to S.24(1) of the Charter for an Injunction prohibiting any federal Covid-mitigation restrictions that are not imposed on the deadlier Flu; or

C) a permanent constitutional exemption from any Covid-mitigation restrictions;

D) an Order for unspecified damages for pain and losses incurred by such unconstitutional restrictions on rights;

E) any Order abridging any time for service or amending any error or omission as to form or content which the Honourable Court may allow.

2. The Grounds of the Application are that:

1) WHO's comparing the Covid 3.4% "Case Fatality Rate" CFR "Apple" not to Flu's known 10% CFR "Apple" but to the Flu's 100-times smaller 0.1% "Infection Fatality Rate" IFR "Orange" to exaggerate the threat of Covid death by a hundredfold;

2) WHO's finding no documented asymptomatic transmission and Wuhan's finding zero transmission by 300 asymptomatics in 10 million tested shows the "Theory of Asymptomatic Transmission" behind masked social distanced lockdowns does not agree with experiment.

3) Canada's 10,947 Covid deaths by Nov 15 2020 had 10,781 in Long-Term-Care and only 166 not in Long-Term-Care died; only 1 in 230,000 Canadians.

4) restrictions on civil liberties to mitigate a virus with lethality hyped a hundredfold are an arbitrary, grossly disproportional, conscience-shocking violation of Charter rights resulting in an unwarranted toll in human degradation and impoverishment.

## BACKGROUND

## PARTIES

3. The Plaintiff is a Canadian Citizen with rights guaranteed by the Canadian Charter of Rights.

4. The Defendant, Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, as represented by the Attorney General of Canada, is named as the representative of the Federal Government of Canada and the Minister of Health for Canada who is the Minister responsible for Health Canada and certain aspects of the Covid-Mitigation legislation.

5. All computations were done in Basic Language by John "The Engineer" Turmel, B. Eng., 4-year Teaching Assistant of Canada's only Mathematics of Gambling course at Carleton University, "Great Canadian Gambler" "TajProfessor" <http://SmartestMan.Ca/gambler> accredited as an Expert Witness in the Mathematics of Gambling by the Federal Tax Court of Canada. <http://SmartestMan.Ca/credits>

## COVID 19 WEAK BIO-ENGINEERED VIRUS

6. Dr. Luc Montagnier who won the Nobel Prize for the discovery of the HIV virus found that Covid-19 contains genetic sequences that could not have arisen in nature and had to be inserted by a lab. Monster "Gain-Of-Function" viruses are developed to be able to find antidotes against them because the other side is doing the same. When "Gain-Of-Function" research was banned in the US, Dr. Fauci funded that research at Wuhan, China. Covid-19 is a man-made virus, albeit a very mild one. After millennia of humanity successfully coping with Corona cold viruses, Bill Gates has warned that the next pandemic will be worse. It is not to say that a vaccine could not be one day necessary if the "worse" virus is someday unleashed.

### 1) WHO EXAGGERATED COVID THREAT BY A HUNDREDFOLD

7. The following definitions are used:

F: Fatalities

R: Rate

C: Cases, with best hospital treatment

CFR: Case Fatality Rate:  $F / C$  Percent.

I: Infections, estimated total

IFR: Infection Fatality Rate:  $F / I$  Percent

P: Population total

PFR: Population Fatality Rate,  $F / P$  Percent

MR: Mortality Rate: Fatalities per 100,000

8. While Case Fatality Rate and Infection Fatality Rate remain consistent, Population Fatality Rate PFR and Mortality Rate MR depend on the seasonal size of the Infected Population. If 1/5th or 1/10th of the total Population are Infected, PFR is a fifth or tenth of the IFR.

9. PFR percent is not yet used in analysis because decimals in percentages have been found to be confusing. Instead, Mortality Rate per-hundred-thousand is used. Just multiply the PFR by 1,000! A PFR = .02 per hundred is an MR = 20 per hundred thousand. Mortality Rate is almost never used unless to mislabel the CFR or IFR!

$$\text{MR} = \text{PFR} * 1,000 \text{ or } \text{PFR} = \text{MR} / 1,000$$

FLU IFR = "0.1%"

10. On Mar 2 2020, Flu Mortality = "0.1%"

Christopher Mores, a global health professor at George Washington University, calculated the average, 10-year mortality rate for flu using CDC data and found it was "0.1%." That "0.1%" rate is frequently cited among experts, including Dr. Anthony Fauci.

<https://khn.org/news/fact-check-coronavirus-homeland-security-chief-flu-mortality-rate/>

11. Professor Mores refers to Flu's well-known Infection Fatality Rate IFR cited by experts as a tenth per hundred infections, one thousandth Mortality Rate is per 100,000, not per 100, for which yearly data for size of infection is lacking.

12. Mislabelling the yearly "Mortality Rate" as a known percentage like the IFR or CFR takes away little from the

point that Flu's reputed "death rate" is always represented to be the well-known "0.1%," whether it is the rightly labeled Infection Fatality Rate IFR per-hundred, or the wrongly labeled Case Fatality Rate CFR per-hundred, or the wrongly labeled Mortality Rate MR per-hundred-thousand. It does show expert confusion on those metrics or worse.

NIH - NIAID: FLU CFR "0.1%"

13. On Feb 29 2020, Dr. Anthony S. Fauci, M.D., H. Clifford Lane, M.D., and Robert R. Redfield, M.D. wrote:

severe seasonal influenza (which has a Case Fatality Rate of approximately 0.1%)

<https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMe2002387>

14. NIH and NIAID have substituted Flu's known 0.1% IFR for its unknown CFR! It is commonly known that "0.1%" is the Flu's Infection Fatality Rate, not its Case Fatality Rate.

FLU CFR = 10%

15. The Flu's 0.1% IFR has been mis-attributed as CFR so regularly that most don't know the Flu's actual CFR. On Nov 1 2014, though Flu's IFR is well known and often used instead of its CFR, National Institute of Health:

Case Fatality Risk [A] of influenza A(H1N1pdm09): We identified very substantial heterogeneity in published estimates, ranging from less than 1 to more than 10,000 deaths per 100,000 [B] cases or infections [C]. The choice of case definition in the denominator accounted for substantial heterogeneity, with the higher estimates based on laboratory-confirmed cases (point estimates = 1-13,500 per 100,000 cases) [D] compared



with symptomatic cases (point estimates = 1-1,200 per 100,000 cases) or infections (point estimates = 1-10 per 100,000 infections) [E].

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3809029/>

16. [A] CFR Case Fatality "Rate" has been changed to CFR Case Fatality "Risk" which would obfuscate searches.

[B] 10,000 deaths per 100,000 is a Mortality Rate, not a CFR percentage. "More than 10,000 per 100,000" is CFR more than 10%!

[C] "Cases or Infections" shows the NIH conflates the IFR and CFR metrics. More than 10,000 of 100,000 of Cases may die but only 100 of 100,000 Infections may die. Only 0.1%, not 10%.

[D] 13,500/100,000 of lab-confirmed Cases is CFR = 13.5%!

[E] up to 10 per 100,000 infections is 0.01%, not the expected 0.1%! Off by a factor of 10?

17. Such confusion with decimals in percents even for "experts" only exists since most were not taught all the Inverts of Unity. Everyone knows how many pennies in a Dollar ( $1*100$ ); how many two-pence ( $2*50$ ) and how many half dollars ( $50*2$ ); how many quarters ( $25*4$ ) and how many 4-pence ( $4*25$ ); how many fifths ( $5*20$ ) and how many twentieths ( $20*5$ ); even how many 3-pence ( $3*33.3$ ) and how many third dollars ( $3.33*3$ ). Other invert pairs are not taught, how many ninths ( $9*11$ ) or elevenths ( $11*9$ ) = 99% (1% error); how many eighths ( $8*12$ ) or twelfths ( $12*8$ ) = 96% (4% error); how many sevenths ( $7*14$ ) and how many fourteenths ( $14*7$ ) = 98% (2% error); how many sixths ( $6*17$ ) and how many seventeenths ( $17*6$ ) = 102 (2% error). TajProfessor's Inverts of Unity, the Missing Dimension in Math completes the schooling on fractions and decimal percentages: <http://SmartestMan.Ca/inverts>

18. On Mar 17 2020, under the best of medical care:

even some so-called mild or common-cold-type coronaviruses that have been known for decades can have case fatality rates as high as 8% when they infect elderly people in nursing homes.

<https://www.statnews.com/2020/03/17/a-fiasco-in-the-making-as-the-coronavirus-pandemic-takes-hold-we-are-making-decisions-without-reliable-data/>

19. With CFR = 8% for a lousy cold and up to CFR = 13.5% for a bad Flu, the data indicates CFR = 10% a workable estimate!

20. On Jan 8 2020, CDC published 2018-2019 data:

CDC estimates that influenza was associated with more than 35.5 million illnesses.. 490,600 hospitalizations, and 34,200 deaths during the 2018-2019 influenza season, similar to the 2012-2013 influenza season.

<https://www.cdc.gov/flu/about/burden/2018-2019.html>

21. IFR,  $F / I = 34K/35.5M = 0.097\%$ , close to 0.10%

CFR,  $F / C = 34K/500K = 7\%$ , still not far from 10%.

22. On Mar 17 2020, IFR data:

so far this season, the estimated number of influenza-like illnesses is between 36,000,000 and 51,000,000, with an estimated 22,000 to 55,000 flu deaths.

<https://www.statnews.com/2020/03/17/a-fiasco-in-the-making-as-the-coronavirus-pandemic-takes-hold-we-are-making-decisions-without-reliable-data/>

23. IFR =  $F / I = 55K/51M = 0.107\%$ , close to 0.1%

24. In early 2020, the CDC 2019-2020 numbers showed the Flu season had 222,552 confirmed Cases from testing and an estimated 22,000 deaths.

25.  $F = 22K, C = 222K; CFR = 9.9\%$ !

26. On Aug 25 2020, New York Times data

On average, seasonal flu strains kill about 0.1 percent of people who become infected. In the current season, there have been at least 34 million cases of flu in the United States, 350,000 hospitalizations..

<https://www.nytimes.com/article/coronavirus-vs-flu.html>

27.  $I / C = 34M/350K = 97$ , close to 100.

$C / I = 350K/34M = 1.03\%$ , very close to 1%.

28. It's so consistent that 1/1,000, 0.1%, of Infected die that the corollary that Fatalities result from 1,000 times more Infections is also true. It works both ways.

$$F = I / 1,000 \text{ or } I = F * 1,000$$

29. It is also consistent that CFR ia about 1/10, 10%, of Hospitalized Intensive Care Unit ICU Cases die and that Fatalities result from 10 times more hospitalized Cases is also true. It works both ways too.

$$F = C / 10 \text{ or } C = F * 10$$

30. The Flu Rule of Thumb:

Fatalities are a thousandth of Infected;  $F = I / 1,000$

Fatalities are a tenth of Cases;  $F = C / 10$

Cases are a hundredth of Infected;  $C = I / 100$

Infected are a thousand times Fatalities;  $I = F * 1000$

Cases are ten times Fatalities;  $C = F * 10$

Infected are a hundred times Cases;  $I = C * 100$

31. One Fatality per Ten Cases per Thousand Infections make Flu analysis serendipitously simple:

The Case Fatality Rate (CFR) who die of Flu,  
Is "10%" in hospitals, a tenth don't make it through.

While (IFR) Infection Rate Fatality of all  
Is Tenth of One Percent, Point One, a Thousandth, very small.

WHO COMPARED COVID 3.4% CFR APPLE TO FLU 0.1% IFR ORANGE

32. On Mar 4 2020 WHO Apple-Oranged the metrics:

WHO said the latest mortality rate for the virus is  
3.4%. This is well above the seasonal flu, which has a  
mortality rate of under 0.1%.

<https://www.thestar.com/news/gta/2020/03/11/the-novel-coronavirus-outbreak-is-threatening-to-turn-into-a-global-pandemic-heres-everything-we-know-about-covid-19.html>

33. Though WHO mislabeled the Covid 3.4/100 CFR and the  
Flu's 0.1/100 IFR as MR Mortality Rate per 100,000, WHO is  
still comparing Covid's 3.4% Apple to Flu's 0.1% Orange  
making the Covid threat look 34 times deadlier than the Flu's.

34. On Mar 6 2020, WHO said:

Mortality for COVID-19 appears higher than for  
influenza, especially seasonal influenza. [A] the crude  
mortality ratio [B] (reported deaths divided by reported  
Cases) is between 3-4% [C], the infection mortality rate [D]  
(reported deaths divided by the number of infections) will  
be lower. For seasonal influenza, mortality is usually well  
below 0.1% [E].

[https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200306-sitrep-46-covid-19.pdf?sfvrsn=96b04adf\\_4](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200306-sitrep-46-covid-19.pdf?sfvrsn=96b04adf_4)

35. [A] Covid's 3.4% CFR is only a third of Flu's 10% CFR so  
Covid's Mortality should not appear higher;

[B] "Crude Mortality Ratio!" CMR: A new metric to avoid the  
old CFR "Case Fatality Rate?"

[C] Mortality Rate is 3-4%. Mortality Rate should be 3,000-  
4,000 out of 100,000, not a percentage? This is WHO!

[D] "Infection Mortality Rate" IMR, not IFR "Infection Fatality Rate" is another new metric. This is WHO!

[E] Flu's "mortality" is always below its IFR once the uninfected population are counted in too, conflating IFR and MR.

36. On Mar 18 2020, Gateway Pundit was the only news source that noted WHO had not compared Covid's 3.4% CFR Apple to Flu's 10% CFR Apple but to Flu's hundredfold too small 0.1% IFR Orange! Grape? and remains alone to this day:

HELLO WORLD! Before Economy Totally Disintegrates - Will Anyone Else Notice WHO Director Made BASIC MATH ERROR in Causing Global Coronavirus Panic?

WHO: Globally, about 3.4% of reported COVID-19 cases have died. By comparison, seasonal flu generally kills far fewer than 1% of those infected.

This statement led to the greatest panic in world history as the global elite media shared and repeated that the coronavirus was many, many times more deadly than the common flu. The problem is his statement is false.

<https://www.thegatewaypundit.com/2020/03/hello-world-before-economy-totally-disintegrates-will-anyone-else-notice-who-director-made-basic-math-error-in-causing-global-coronavirus-panic/>

37. That the Covid 3.4% CFR was 34 times worse than an average 60K Flu season justified the panic over 2.2 million predicted fatalities. Projecting that 2 million can die is 34 times a 60K Flu. When compared to the Flu's 10% Apple, it's not 34 times worse but 3 times better. A factor of a hundred. But if the Coronavirus has similar CFR to IFR ratio as the Flu, then IFR should be the 3.4% CFR divided by 100, Covid IFR = 0.034%, a third of the Flu's tenth of a percent. Comparing to the Flu's actual 10% CFR, Covid is only a third which does allay concern. Covid's 3.4% CFR compared to Flu's 0.1% IFR amplified the panic a hundredfold:

When Fauci said Corona death rate: "thirty times the Flu,"  
 Would you've hit panic button sounding the alarm bell too?  
 Had Fauci told the truth, it's really only third as bad,  
 Would you've hit panic button sounding the alarm so sad?

Can't blame the Chief Executives for sounding the alarm,  
 It's not their job to check if expert models do more harm.  
 But a Chief Engineer must check the model blueprint out,  
 To find out Fauci fudged the metrics. "False alarm!" to shout.

When heard the Covid CFR was three point four percent!  
 One-third the 10% of Flu, Good News was heaven sent.  
 But Fauci Apple-Oranged Three Point Four to Flu's Point One  
 Fear Factor amplified a hundredfold when the scam begun.

Hear Gateway Pundit "apples not to apples" first complain,  
 When checked twas found an Apple to an Orange was the stain.  
 How will a world of scientists admit to being fooled,  
 By ruse most elementary in which we thought them schooled.

It's easier into a scam the simpletons to coax,  
 Than to convince them that they have been taken by a hoax.  
 Delay to cancel Fauci False Alarm is costing lives!  
 The nation quickest back to normal's nation that survives.

It feels like we escaped a plague that came so very near.  
 A panic justifiable; now hard to break the fear.  
 Admit it's "not so bad" to end imaginary Hell,  
 We must shake hands and hug again to break pandemic spell

<http://SmartestMan.Ca/fauci>

COVID 3.4% CFR NOW 1% CFR LIGHT

38. On Nov 1 1974 NIH Case Fatality RISK Definitions!

[A] The case fatality RISK for a population is estimated as the number of H1N1pdm09-associated deaths divided by the number of H1N1pdm09 cases in that population...

[B] The denominator could be counts or estimates of the number of laboratory-confirmed H1N1pdm09 cases, the number of symptomatic H1N1pdm09 cases, or the number of infections.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3809029/>

39. [A] Case Fatality "Rate" defined as Case Fatality "Risk" can only detract from searches;

B] The denominator of the NIC Case Fatality "Risk" can include Infections, not just Cases! CFR Light! Mislabelling the Flu's IFR as its CFR to then compare to the Covid CFR is comparing a CFR Apple to an IFR Orange disguised as an CFR Apple. The Apple-Orange comparison is the most elementary scam in statistics.

40. On Feb 29 2020, Dr. Anthony S. Fauci, M.D., H. Clifford Lane, M.D., and Robert R. Redfield, M.D. wrote:

[A] If one assumes that the number of asymptomatic or minimally symptomatic cases is several times as high as the number of reported cases,

[B] the case fatality rate may be considerably less than 1%.

<https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMe2002387>

41. [A] "Asymptomatic or minimally symptomatic" are not Cases, they're Infections. Counting "asymptomatic or minimally symptomatic" patients as Cases isn't a Case Fatality Rate any more, it's a CFR Light. Their CFR depends on how many Infections they mislabel as Cases. Add Infections, get CFR Lighter.

B] Covid does not have a case fatality rate of less than 1%, that's counting Infections. It has an expected 3.4% CFR.

42. On Mar 26 2020, Dr. Fauci said:

"The flu has a mortality of 0.1 percent, this has a mortality of 10-times that.

<https://www.wcnc.com/article/news/health/coronavirus/data-cdc-estimates-covid-19-mortality-rate/275-fc43f37f-6764-45e3-b615-123459f0082b>

43. Though Dr. Fauci again wrongly uses the Mortality metric, the Covid threat is now only tenfold as deadly and not the 34 times as deadly as previously advertised. Walking back their 3.4% over-estimate? Compared to Flu's 0.1% IFR, Covid 3.4% CFR sounded 34 times deadlier. But reduced to 1% by counting Infections, CFR Light is only tenfold as deadly as previously feared. But always mis-compared to Flu's 0.1% IFR and never to its true 10% CFR. But when compared to the Flu's real 10% comparable rate, Covid is a now tenth the danger of the CFR of the Flu, no longer a third!

44. Dr. Ronald B. Brown at University of Waterloo wrote: Public health lessons learned from biases in coronavirus mortality overestimation,

The WHO got it right in that influenza has an IFR of 0.1% or lower, not a CFR of 0.1%.

[A] Dr. Fauci reported that Covid-19 has a mortality rate of 1%, which he said had fallen from 2-3% after taking into account asymptomatic infections.

[B] And Dr. Fauci probably meant to say that Covid-19 has an IFR of 1% (not CFR of 1%) after having considered asymptomatic infections.

[https://www.cambridge.org/core/services/aop-cambridge-core/content/view/7ACD87D8FD2237285EB667BB28DCC6E9/S1935789320002980a.pdf/public\\_health\\_lessons\\_learned\\_from\\_biases\\_in\\_coronavirus\\_mortality\\_overestimation.pdf](https://www.cambridge.org/core/services/aop-cambridge-core/content/view/7ACD87D8FD2237285EB667BB28DCC6E9/S1935789320002980a.pdf/public_health_lessons_learned_from_biases_in_coronavirus_mortality_overestimation.pdf)

45. [A] Professor Brown noted that had Dr. Fauci not lowered the Covid CFR to CFR Light, the threat would have been 20, 30 times the now lighter 10 times the danger of Flu.

[B] Dr. Fauci could not have probably meant to say Covid has an IFR of 1%, he was talking about reducing its CFR from 3.4% to CFR Light 1%.

[C] Professor Brown also mentioned the CDC had no definition for IFR at their web site and only in July of this year was IFR uploaded as a "new" metric!!! Maybe Dr. Fauci had really never heard of the IFR and CFR Light was all he knew?



46. On Oct 3 2020, Joe Hoft proudly crowed about Gateway Pundit being proven right on not being Apple-Oranged:

WHO Finally Agrees Our March Analysis was Correct:  
The WHO's Early Coronavirus Mortality Rate Was Irresponsibly Overstated and We Called Them Out with The CORRECT NUMBERS!

On March 17, 2020 The Gateway Pundit first reported on the controversial Ethiopian politician and Director General of the World Health Organization (WHO), Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus, and his irresponsible and completely inaccurate fear mongering.

Tedros claimed in a press conference in early March that the fatality rate for the coronavirus was 3.4% - many multiples that of the fatality rate of the common flu which is estimated to be around 0.1%. This egregiously false premise [A] led to the greatest global pandemic panic in world history.

The Director General of the WHO spoke on March 3, 2020 and shared this related to the coronavirus:

Globally, about 3.4% of reported COVID-19 cases have died. By comparison, seasonal flu generally kills far fewer than 1% of those infected.

The WHO did not compare "apples to apples".

We reviewed the WHO's data and statements and determined that the fatality rate for the China coronavirus does not include those who had the coronavirus but were not sick enough to seek medical attention or be tested [B]. This is why the flu fatality rate is 0.1% and the coronavirus fatality rate was reported at 3.4%!

The two rates are like comparing apples to oranges. By doing so, the coronavirus fatality rate was overstated when compared to the flu [C]. The WHO and liberal media created a worldwide crisis and panic by falsely comparing the two numbers!

The Gateway Pundit writers Jim and Joe Hoft.. attacked for our reporting and ridiculed by the far-left for "downplaying the danger of the spread of [the] coronavirus in the US." [D] On Friday time proved us right. A couple of days ago the CDC came out with updated numbers indicating as we noted in March that the China coronavirus is much like the flu:

China, the WHO and the medical elites in the US created this global economic meltdown based on fraudulent numbers and bogus models. We knew it and we pointed it out and we were attacked. We were the first and only to

point this out. We did so because we figured out the lies. And now the WHO finally admitted that our initial numbers were correct! [E]

<https://www.thegatewaypundit.com/2020/10/right-march-provided-evidence-coronavirus-mortality-rate-grossly-overstated-today-finally-came-conclusion/>

47. [A] It is not a mere false premise. It is an Apple to Orange Mis-comparison.

[B] China does not count Infections in its CFR!

[C] Over stated by a hundredfold is more precise.

[D] Those denying the threat face the accusation of causing deaths if wrong while those hyping the threat face no more than "Oops, sorry for wasting your time and money." It is a far greater risk to deny a medical hoax than perpetrate one.

[E] It is nice to be proven right and still alone.

48. On Dec 29, a Google search finds current Covid CFR:

Canada:  $F = 15K$ ;  $C = 557K$ ;  $CFR = 15K/557K = 2.7\%$ .

World:  $F = 1.8M$ ;  $C = 81M$ ;  $CFR = 1.8M/81M^2 = 2.2\%$ .

Both rates are below the original 3.4% CFR predicted but higher than the 1% CFR Light also predicted.

2) NO DOCUMENTED ASYMPTOMATIC TRANSMISSION; ZERO!

"It doesn't matter how beautiful your theory is, how smart you are. If it doesn't agree with experiment, it's wrong."  
(Mathematician Richard Feynman)

49. On Apr 2 2020, WHO reported:

There are few reports of laboratory-confirmed cases who are truly asymptomatic, and to date, there has been no documented asymptomatic transmission [A]. This does not exclude the possibility that it may occur [B].

<https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200402-sitrep-73-covid-19.pdf>

50. [A] no documented asymptomatic transmission." Up until April, people not sniffing were not shedding.

[B] Of course, no asymptomatic transmission documented so far does not exclude the possibility that an asymptomatic transmitter may one day be found.

51. On Jun 3 2020, AP: 10 Million Tests in Wuhan

It identified just 300 positive cases, all of whom had no symptoms. The city found no infections among 1,174 close contacts of the people who tested positive, suggesting they were not spreading the virus easily to others. That is a potentially encouraging development because of widespread concern that infected people without symptoms could be silent spreaders of the disease.

52. ZERO of 300 asymptomatics in 10 Million tested does allay widespread concern that infected people without symptoms could be silent spreaders. An Asymptomatic or Pre-Symptomatic spreader of a deadly virus would unknowingly infect clusters of family and friends. But no such clusters have been found, the distribution of patients has been random; the symptomless are not spreading to their clusters.

53. On Jun 8 2020, WHO says none found is "very rare"

Maria Van Kerkhove:

00:34:04 We have a number of reports from countries who are doing very detailed contact tracing. They're following asymptomatic cases, they're following contacts and they're not finding secondary transmission onward. It's very rare and much of that is not published in the literature...

We are constantly looking at this data and we're trying to get more information from countries to truly answer this question. It still appears to be rare that an asymptomatic individual actually transmits onward.

<https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/transcripts/who-audio-emergencies-coronavirus-press-conference-08jun2020.pdf>

54. Yet, "very rare" "no documented asymptomatic transmission" is the raison d'etre for masked social distanced lockdowns. If there is no symptomless spread, there is no raison d'etre for Covid-mitigation restrictions.

55. On Jun 9 2020, CBC reported:

WHO backtracks on claim that asymptomatic spread of COVID-19 is 'very rare'  
Experts say research on extent of asymptomatic spread of COVID-19 still emerging...

Maria Van Kerkhove, the COVID-19 technical lead at WHO, has walked back statements that the spread of COVID-19 from people who do not show symptoms is "very rare," amid backlash from experts who have questioned the claim due to a lack of data. [A]

On Tuesday, Van Kerkhove aimed to clear up "misunderstandings" [B] about those statements in an updated briefing, stressing that she was referring to "very few studies" that tried to follow asymptomatic carriers of the virus over time to see how many additional people were infected.

"I was responding to a question at the press conference, I wasn't stating a policy of WHO," she said. "I was just trying to articulate what we know." [C]

Van Kerkhove said she didn't intend to imply that asymptomatic transmission of the virus globally was "very rare," but rather that the available data based on modelling studies and member countries had not been able to provide a clear enough picture on the amount of asymptomatic transmission [D].

"That's a big, open question," she said. "But we do know that some people who are asymptomatic, some people who don't have symptoms, can transmit the virus on." [E]  
Some experts say it is not uncommon for infected people to show no symptoms [F].

But data is sparse on how likely such people are to transmit the disease [G].

"There's a big question mark at the actual data in real-world observations with asymptomatic [carriers]," Saxinger said. "Asymptomatic spread is a dumpster fire in terms of data." [H]

56. [A] What data do experts who have questioned the claim due to a lack of data expect after having found "none" and "zero" so far? A check-list of everything expected to be found that was not found? more data on the nothing found? Finding "none" and "zero" is not due to a lack of data but due to a lack of Asymptomatic Transmission.

[B] There was no "misunderstandings" about those statements even if she was only referring to "very few studies" when Wuhan had such a huge sample with a zero result. The lack of smaller studies is not persuasive.

[C] Not stating a WHO policy but letting escape that experiment had found no evidence for the WHO Theory of Asymptomatic Transmission policy. "Very rare" though it was still expected to find some someday.

[D] How can modelling studies be able to provide a clear enough picture on the amount of asymptomatic transmission when there is none reported?

[E] The policy that "people who don't have symptoms can transmit" is the theory of behind masked social distanced lockdown that has not been documented by experiment.

[F] "experts say it's not uncommon for infected to have no symptoms." And yet, only 300 of 10 million in Wuhan had no symptoms. 0.003%. The experts are wrong, again. It is 1/33,000 uncommon for infected to have no symptoms.

[G] So far, the sparse data shows "none" to April and "zero" of 300 of 10 million tested in Wuhan in June.

[H] A "dumpster fire is an apt description for an unproven theory being shredded by data from experiment.

57. On Jun 10 2020, Dr. Fauci said:

The WHO's remark that transmission of the coronavirus by people who never developed symptoms was rare "was not

correct," Dr. Anthony Fauci said. The organization "walked that back because there's no evidence to indicate that's the case," he said. The WHO said its comment was a misunderstanding" and "we don't have that answer yet."

<https://www.cnbc.com/2020/06/10/dr-anthony-fauci-says-whos-remark-on-asymptomatic-coronavirus-spread-was-not-correct.html>

58. Dr. Fauci should know zero Asymptomatic Transmission from 300 Wuhan Asymptomatics out of 10 million is not "no evidence." We do now have the answer. Evidence of zero spread in Wuhan means "very rare" is almost correct. What is "very rarer" than zero?

59. In Jul 2020, the CDC published:

Public Health Implications of Transmission While Asymptomatic

The existence [A] of persons with asymptomatic infection who are capable of transmitting the virus to others has several implications.

First, the case-fatality rate for COVID-19 may be lower than currently estimated ratios if asymptomatic infections are included [B].

Second, transmission while asymptomatic [C] reinforces the value of community interventions to slow the transmission of COVID-19.

Knowing that asymptomatic transmission was a possibility [D], CDC recommended key interventions [E] including physical distancing, use of cloth face coverings in public, and universal masking in healthcare facilities to prevent transmission by asymptomatic and symptomatic persons with infection.

Third, asymptomatic transmission enhances the need to scale up the capacity for widespread testing and thorough contact tracing to detect asymptomatic infections, interrupt undetected transmission chains [F], and further bend the curve downward.

[https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/eid/article/26/7/20-1595\\_article](https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/eid/article/26/7/20-1595_article)

60. [A] Implications only if the existence of persons with asymptomatic infection who are capable of transmitting the virus to others is true. So far, it is not.

[B] CFR Light, IFR in disguise.

[C] Community interventions have no value in slowing the transmission while asymptomatic if transmission while asymptomatic can not be found.

[D] Beautiful Theory does not agree with experiment.

[E] Key interventions are not needed to prevent transmission by asymptomatic persons with no documented evidence yet that they do transmit.

[F] No transmission chains from Asymptomatics have yet been detected to interrupt.

61. On Nov 20 2020 Dr. Fauci said:

40-45% of transmission is due to asymptomatic people unwittingly infecting others. This is why masks are so essential - by wearing one, you protect other people even if you don't know that you're infected.

<https://coronavirus.medium.com/anthony-faucis-thoughts-on-covid-19-transmission-treatments-and-vaccines-b7908ac0a749>

62. On Nov 21 2020, CDC said:

Most [A] coronavirus cases spread from people with no symptoms, CDC says in new report  
Research shows that people "who feel well and may be unaware of their infectiousness to others" likely account for more than 50% of COVID-19 transmissions, the CDC said in a science update on Friday. People with no symptoms could drive Thanksgiving infections  
The CDC report stressed that masks help reduce asymptomatic spread since they can protect [B] both the mask-wearer and the people around them.

<https://www.businessinsider.com/cdc-most-coronavirus-cases-spread-from-people-without-symptoms-2020-11>

63. [A] While WHO and Wuhan reported "none" and "zero" infections by Asymptomatics, CDC and Dr. Fauci report more than half! A contradiction. Whom to believe? Those with the theory or those with the data to disprove the theory?

[B] Protect against people who do not shed?

64. On Aug 6 2020, an article shared on Facebook from Dr. Mercola titled: "Asymptomatic People do not spread COVID 19" was labelled by Facebook with:

"People infected with Cov-2 can transmit the virus to others, even if they do not show symptoms of the disease."

65. Facebook Fact-Checker said:

people who are sick and people who are infected but show no symptoms as two distinct groups of people. Both groups can be contagious and must therefore follow the same preventive measures to avoid infecting others. Scientific evidence indicates that about half of SARS-CoV-2 transmission occurs before infected individuals experience any symptoms of COVID-19. Studies show that asymptomatic carriers, who are people that never develop symptoms of COVID-19, carry as much of the SARS-CoV-2 virus as symptomatic patients and can spread the virus if they do not take adequate measures, such as wearing masks or maintaining physical distance from others. recent estimates from the CDC indicate that around 50% of SARS-CoV-2 transmission occurs during the incubation period before infected individuals experience any symptoms [5,6].

<https://healthfeedback.org/claimreview/people-infected-with-sars-cov-2-can-transmit-the-virus-to-others-even-if-they-do-not-show-symptoms-of-the-disease-and-are-not-considered-sick/>

66. WHO reported no documented asymptomatic transmission." Wuhan reported "ZERO." WHO reports "Rare" and "Very rare" by symptomless Infected. But Facebook says its official policy is "half of infections are from Asymptomatics!" To disagree with Facebook's medical opinion is to be banned. Dr. Mercola's medical opinions have been banned, they are that good. If this were Poland, Facebook could be fined for taking down truthful legal information.

67. On Dec 25 2020, JAMA said:

New Study Suggests Asymptomatic COVID Patients Aren't "Driver Of Transmission"  
The American Medical Association's JAMA Network Open



journal has published new research from a government-backed study that appears to offer new evidence that asymptomatic spread of COVID-19 may be significantly lower than previously thought [A]. Some members of the public might remember all the way back in February and January when public officials first speculated that mass mask-wearing might not be that helpful unless individuals were actually sick.

They famously back-tracked on that, and - for that, and other reasons - decided that we should all wear masks, and that lockdowns were more or less the best solution to the problem [B].

In the paper noted above which examined 54 separate studies with nearly 78K total participants, the authors claim that "The lack of substantial transmission from observed asymptomatic index cases is notable... These findings are consistent with other household studies [C] reporting asymptomatic index cases as having limited role in household transmission." two British scientists recently published an editorial in the BMJ imploring scientists to rethink how the virus spreads "asymptomatically". They pointed to "the absence of strong evidence that asymptomatic people are a driver of transmission" as a reason to question such practices as "mass testing in schools, universities, and communities."

the WHO's current guidance on the issue is that "while someone who never develops symptoms can also pass the virus to others, it is still not clear to what extent this occurs, and more research is needed in this area" [D].

<https://www.zerohedge.com/geopolitical/new-study-suggests-asymptomatic-covid-patients-arent-driver-transmission>

68. [A] "lower than previously thought." Can't get much lower than NONE from the WHO and ZERO from Wuhan.

[B] No reason but keep wearing masks even if not sick.

[C] "the lack.. is notable.. consistent with other studies" With "none" documented by WHO, "zero" in Wuhan, "none" consistent with other studies, experiment has disproven the theory of Asymptomatic Transmission.

[D] With none, it is not clear to what extent it occurs? The clarity problem isn't with the data, it's with the viewer:

Asymptomatic is transmission with no symptoms seen,  
 Not knowing who's a threat, the answer is to quarantine.  
 Social distance remedied the never knowing who,  
 Would be infectious, even though they would be very few.

But on June 8 WHO said it won't transmit without a sneeze,  
 Like Flu, no symptoms means no danger. Coping's now a breeze.  
 It will be tough to break the spell, get close again like yore,  
 Where we share cards and sit at poker table like before.

### 3) 166 DEATHS NOT IN LONG-TERM-CARE

69. On Nov 15 2020, CTV reported 10,947 deaths out of 38 million Canadians had 10,781 in long-term care (98.5%) omitting the difference of only 166 deaths (1.5%) not in long-term-care. The threat of death by Covid to non-long-term-care Canadians is  $166/38,000,000 = 0.00044\%$ . 1 in 230,000! 99.99956% not in Long-Term-Care will not die.

70. Lockdowns, masks and social distancing may make some sense in Long-Term-Care homes with the susceptible people but for a 1/230,000 danger for those not in Long-Term-Care, such restrictions make no sense at all. The 166 deaths were probably Canada's sickest not in Long-Term-Care with co-morbidities such as obesity, diabetes, cancer, heart condition. If 90% of the 166 had such co-morbidities, only a tenth of the 166 Canadians who died were really healthy, 0.000044%, 1 in 2.3 million! Almost no healthy Canadians have died. Though the online CTV replay has edited out the numbers, what is being hidden is always of prime interest.

#### COVERING FOR THE LOW DEATHS

71. With the world panicked by a threat hyped a hundredfold added to the undocumented Asymptomatic Transmission Theory that sniffles are not needed to spread Covid makes the exaggerated plague invisibly ubiquitous. The only way to cover up when deaths do not match exaggerated expectations is to fudge the statistical Cases and Fatalities data.

#### EARLY INTUBATIONS

72. Quick intubation killed 90% of patients and is now discontinued. Patients needed oxygen, not ventilators to help pumping it in.

#### INFECTED PATIENTS TO LONG-TERM-CARE HOMES

73. Sending infected persons into Long-Term-Care homes with the only demographic really susceptible to infection sadly helped increase the real death numbers until discontinued.

#### CDC DEATH CERTIFICATE GUIDELINES CHANGE

74. On Mar 24 2020, the CDC changed the Death Certificate guidelines from the previous 17-year standard to a new standard where even presumed not-tested Covid suspicion was raised in priority while "bullet to the head" or "lightning strike" were lowered to secondary co-morbidities. New symptoms like Diarrhea, vomiting, stomach cramps may now confirm death by Covid. Some Death Certificates do not even mention Covid at all with Covid being later added to the Covid count under "All deaths within 30 days of positive are Covid."

75. On Dec 27 2020, Gateway Pundit Joe Hoft reported:

330,000 Americans Die "With" China Coronavirus - CDC says Number Who Died "From" Coronavirus Is Much Less, Around 6 Percent

We reported in August that the CDC admits that only 6% of all deaths in the US classified as Coronavirus deaths actually died from the China Coronavirus alone.

Yes, this was from the CDC's own reporting.

So today it looks like less than 20,000 deaths in the US (330,000 x 6% = 19,800) over the past year have actually been due to the coronavirus only. The remainder of the deaths reported by the CDC include accidents, overdoses, suicides and those presumed to have had the coronavirus upon their death.

So basically many local and state governments are shutting down their local businesses and institutions due to over-inflated statistics regarding the number of Americans who died from this China oriented coronavirus.

<https://www.thegatewaypundit.com/2020/12/330000-americans-die-china-coronavirus-closer-20000-died-china-coronavirus/>

76. On Dec 28 2020, Facebook Fact-Checker Science Feedback:

False claim shared by President Trump that only 6% of CDC-reported deaths are from COVID-19 is based on flawed reasoning... Independent fact-checkers say this information has no basis in fact.

Learn more about how Facebook works with independent fact-checkers to stop the spread of false information.

<https://www.facebook.com/john.turmel/posts/10159912392987281>

77. Facebook saying that "only 6% of CDC-reported deaths are from COVID-19" is "false" and "based on flawed reasoning" is belied by CDC's own site report:

For 6% of the deaths, COVID-19 was the only cause mentioned. For deaths with conditions or causes in addition to COVID-19, on average, there were 2.9 additional conditions or causes per death.

[https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nvss/vsrr/covid\\_weekly/index.htm](https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nvss/vsrr/covid_weekly/index.htm)

78. How can it be flawed reasoning leading to a false claim to state a published fact, easily verifiable even if most

will not. Under the previous CDC guidelines, only 6%, 1/17th of Death Certificates, would have recorded Covid as Cause of Death, 94%, 16/17ths would have registered the other morbidity that really caused the death with Covid as the secondary co-morbidity.

79. If 94% of Covid deaths are really other co-morbidities, it would be expected that the deaths for other co-morbidities currently now in the Covid column would decrease. Overall Fatalities in the US not having risen makes it more likely Covid was substituted for those co-morbidities. Flu's disappearance from this year's record suggests continued mis-attribution.

#### PCR TEST FALSE POSITIVES

80. PCR Test kits with sensitivity cycles set too high have generated massive false positives detecting Covid from many reported silly things but over-sensitivity was necessary to cover for the massively exaggerated Covid death count expected from a virus 34 times deadlier than the Flu.

81. Facebook fact-checked Dr. Roger Hodkinson:

Hodkinson's Instagram post also states that "testing should stop" because it finds the virus in people who have no symptoms, producing false numbers..." [A]  
According to Dr. Luis Ostrosky-Zeichner, a professor of infectious diseases at McGovern Medical School at the University of Texas Health Science Center in Houston positive COVID-19 molecular test "pretty much nearly assures that you have genetic material of the virus in your system, whether you have the active infection or are recovering from it." [B]  
This is part of The Associated Press ongoing effort to fact-check misinformation that is shared widely online, including work with Facebook to identify and reduce the circulation of false stories on the platform.

Here's more information on Facebooks fact-checking program:

<https://www.facebook.com/help/1952307158131536>

<https://apnews.com/article/fact-checking-9765563716>

82. [A] Testing symptomless people who are not shedding serves no purpose is all Dr. Hodkinson said.

[B] That the test "pretty much nearly assures that you have genetic material of the virus in your system" is belied by the existence of over-sensitive false positives!

#### CHINA

83. The panic started with the viral video showing Chinese Covid victims collapsed and dead in the streets with citizens being locked down and sealed in their homes. Have there been any such collapsed corpses anywhere else?

#### SWAMPED V EMPTY HOSPITALS

84. Too many patients were sent to too few swamped hospitals while other hospitals and hospital ships sat empty! So many hospitals shut down and laid off staff in anticipation of a surge that never came while the breathless reports were about the few that were swamped. Intensive Care Units (ICUs) are always near capacity in Flu season so reports about hospitals being overwhelmed during Flu season are not particularly persuasive.

#### ALARMISTS SAY DENIERS ENDANGER OTHERS

85. It's the same persuasion technique as Global Warming. Deniers endanger everyone else just as not complying with

medical restrictions endangers everyone else. If a Denier is wrong, people will die. If an alarmist is wrong, resources have been wasted. So it's a much safer bet to alarm than to assuage and it takes moral courage to follow the math.

#### FOCUS ON INFECTIONS NOT DEATHS

86. With deaths decreasing, focus on rising Infections from unreliable PCR tests makes a rosy picture look gloomy.

#### DISCREDITING PROMISING HCQ ALTERNATIVE

87. While in full-blown promotion of potential vaccines, other more regular flu-like remedies including vitamins have shown promise and been discredited by MainStreamMedia.

88. The most egregious example is when France's Dr. Didier Raoult announced he used HydroxyChloroQuine HCQ to save 99.2% of his 4,000 Cases and only losing CFR 0.8%! His Covid CFR was under 1% with HCQ! President Trump mentioned that it looked promising and there were many patient and doctor testimonials to its efficacy discounting any need for a vaccine! So this decades-safe medication had to be discredited.

89. A report in the Lancet and New England Journal of Medicine announced a global study of 90,000 had found much danger using HCQ for Covid which caused the cancellation of HCQ trials around the world. Whom to believe, a sample of 4,000 showing it worked great or a global survey saying it was dangerous? The report was soon shown to be completely fraudulent and retracted by Lancet and NEJM who blew their credibility to squelch the good HCQ news and further the panic.

90. Worse than such fraud, a Bill Gates-funded Oxford Recovery HCQ test in the UK used a different protocol than in France that lost 25.7% of their 1,500 patients compared to Raoult's protocol that lost 0.8% of his 4,000, 32 times a greater loss! Why did UK lose so many and France so few?

91. A Normal Bell Curve can be fit to any average from any known sample to tell us the range of averages expected from more samples. Expect 2/3 to land within 1 Standard Deviation of the average. 95% to land within 2 Standard Deviations, 99.7% to land within 3SD. The formula for the Standard Deviation around any mean is an elementary Square Root  $SQR(n * p * q)$  where

n: number in sample; f: number of Fatalities;

p: probability of Fatality: fatalities / number:  $f / n$ ;

q: probability of life: non-fatalities / number:  $1 - p$ ,

92. France:  $f=32$ ;  $n=4,000$ ;  $p=32/4,000 = .008$   $q=1-.008 = .992$   
 $SD=SQR(4000*(.008)*(.992)) = 5.7$ , say 6 about mean 32.

93. If you did more 4,000-patient tests with the France protocol, the Bell curve of spread around the mean predicts:

- 66%, 2/3 of results will be between 26 and 38 deaths. 33%, 1/3 of the results are in the tails. 1/6 of samples with less than 26 and 1/6 with more than 38;
- 95% of samples will be between 20 and 44 deaths. 1/20 outside. 1/40 less than 20 and 1/40 more than 44;
- 99.7% of results will be between 14 and 50 deaths. 1/370 outside. 1/740 less than 14 and 1/740 more than 50;
- 99.997 of results will be between 8 and 56 deaths, 1/16,500 outside. 1/33,000 less than 8 and 1/33,000 more



than 56. The odds of someone losing more than 56 patients following Raoult's protocol is 33,000 to 1 against.

94. Applying the quick and easy Bell Curve Equation to any average "p" and sample size "n" to let you know in a short instant the range of future expected results Belled about any mean is the most invaluable tool in statistics.

95. How far off is the Oxford Recovery HCQ test that had 25.7% (396) deaths in over 1500 patients? 25.7% is 32 times greater than .8%. Had Oxford also tested a 4,000 sample, extrapolating shows they would have had 1,040/4,000 deaths compared to Raoult's 32/4,000! When it's 33,000:1 against more than 56 deaths and the Recovery protocol lost over a thousand per 4,000 more, that is off Raoult's 32 by 1,008. That's 180 5.7 Standard Deviations away.

96. Something unusual in the Gates Oxford Recovery protocol had to have caused the extra 1,008/4,000 deaths for comparable sample. It was found the Gates protocol used much higher dosages of HCQ than the Raoult protocol to enable Gates to lose 25% more patients in UK than Raoult in France. Had the Gates test used even greater overdoses, he could have lost 50%, even 100% of the subjects. The Gates failed experimental protocol does not belie the Raoult experimental protocol. The Gates protocol was really murder on his patients. Suppressing hopeful alternatives that furthered the Covid panic suggest deliberate malevolence.

## CENSORSHIP

97. In July 2020, AmericasFrontlineDoctors.com held a press conference in Washington where Dr. Simone Gold touted her positive experiences with HydroxyChloroQuine. Their site was deplatformed and she has since been fired by her two hospitals. Other doctors have had their medical licenses suspended. Doctors who have spoken out with great results for HCQ against the orthodox narrative have also been persecuted. In the US, doctors have had their web sites taken down! suffered hit pieces by Facebook. Who benefits in discrediting a promising "cheap" treatment?

98. There has been a general slaughter of unorthodox viewpoints on the Internet. Youtube has killed hundreds of channels, Twitter, Facebook, other platforms have instituted draconian censorship policies.

99. On Apr 1 2020, John Turmel on the Youtube SmartestManSays channel published the first daily video on the only way to save the planet, the Mr. Spock Upgrade of the central bank software to provide all citizens with access to interest-free credits to tide them over the pandemic with a lifetime to pay it back was banking on Earth as in Heaven. The videos posited obtaining antibodies from the urine of survivors and pointed out delay in cancelling Fauci's false alarm was costing deaths of desperation.

100. On July 25 2020, "COVID Apple-Orange Data Hoax" was published at <https://youtu.be/btrGKYymJeI>

101. On Aug 26 2020, 'Youtube Downs "Covid Apple Orange Data Hoax" Video' is published: [https://youtu.be/ikoh\\_R8X7PY](https://youtu.be/ikoh_R8X7PY)

Youtube informs me my video "Covid Apple-Orange Data Hoax" was taken down for violating their community guidelines on contradicting WHO. They wouldn't tell me what part of it was objectionable so I'm going to redo it in pieces to find out which ones will be banned. They can be found at <http://SmartestMan.Ca/kotp> videos index.

102. The topics were cut into 8 videos and published separately. None was taken down. Perhaps each alone did not have the same impact on the censors than the united whole. Wonder why the Apple-Orange hoax never got out? Disqus has banned commentary by John Turmel to the 750,000 sites that use its platform. Censorship at the core without users knowing.

#### 4) LOCKDOWN GAIN DOES NOT JUSTIFY LOCKDOWN PAIN

103. Covid-Mitigation restrictions include lockdowns & curfews, quarantines, mandatory masks, mandatory social distancing, mandatory vaccine, mandatory immunity card for public services. The debilitating effects of lockdowns on prisoners is well-documented even if the effects of home arrest are less so. Lockdowns have been a Canadian disaster regularly detailed in the news. It is hoped it should not take much to convince the court that suicides, murders, abuses, addictions, truancy, have all gone up under lockdown. Personal loss suffered not visiting relatives, time lost by line-ups at stores, higher prices to pay for protection measures, stress from the distress shown by many. Neighbors snitching on neighbors, friendships breaking over accusations of deniers putting alarmists at risk from the invisible plague by not obeying preventative measures seriously.

104. Such restrictions on civil liberties to mitigate a sham-virus are an arbitrary, grossly disproportional, conscience-shocking violation of the Charter Section 2 right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association is gone, S.6 right to obility, S.7 right to life, liberty and security, S.8 right to be secure against unreasonable search or seizure, S.9 right to not to be arbitrarily detained or imprisoned, S.12 right to not be subjected to any cruel and unusual treatment or punishment, not in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice.

#### LOCKDOWN FUTILITY

105. On Jan 17 2021, a new peer reviewed study out of Stanford University: "Assessing Mandatory Stay-at-Home and Business Closure Effects on the Spread of COVID-19" in 10 different countries, including England, France, Germany and Italy wrote:

"In summary, we fail to find strong evidence supporting a role for more restrictive NPIs in the control of COVID in early 2020. We do not question the role of all public health interventions, or of coordinated communications about the epidemic, but we fail to find an additional benefit of stay-at-home orders and business closures. The data cannot fully exclude the possibility of some benefits. However, even if they exist, these benefits may not match the numerous harms of these aggressive measures. More targeted public health interventions that more effectively reduce transmissions may be important for future epidemic control without the harms of highly restrictive measures."

<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1111/eci.13484>

## DR. HODKINSON PROTESTS SHAMDEMIC

106. On Nov 13 2020, Dr. Roger Hodkinson's righteous rant:

What I'm going to say is lay language, and blunt. It is counter-narrative... There is utterly unfounded public hysteria driven by the media and politicians. [A] It's outrageous. This is the greatest hoax ever perpetrated on an unsuspecting public. [B]

There is absolutely nothing that can be done to contain this virus. Other than protecting older, more vulnerable people. It should be thought of as nothing more than a bad flu season. [C] This is not Ebola. It's not SARS. It's politics playing medicine and that's a very dangerous game.

There is no action of any kind needed other than what happened last year when we felt unwell. We stayed home, we took chicken noodle soup, we didn't visit granny and we decided when we would return to work. We didn't need anyone to tell us. Everywhere should be opened tomorrow as well as was stated in the Great Barrington Declaration..

All that should be done is to protect the vulnerable and to give them all in the nursing homes that are under your control, give them all 3,000 to 5,000 international units of vitamin D every day which has been shown to radically reduce the likelihood of Infection.

And I would remind you all that using the province's own statistics, the risk of death under 65 in this province is one in 300,000. One in 300,000. You've got to get a grip on this. [D]

The scale of the response that you are undertaking with no evidence for it is utterly ridiculous given the consequences of acting in a way that you're proposing. All kinds of suicides, business closures, funerals, weddings etc. It's simply outrageous! It's just another bad flu and You've got to get your minds around that. Let people make their own decisions. You should be totally out of the business of medicine. You're being led down the garden path by the chief medical officer of health for this province. I am absolutely outraged that this has reached this level. It should all stop tomorrow.

<https://vimeo.com/487473042>

107. [A] The hysteria has simple people deeming a Tenth of a Flu as a Plague Ten Times worse than Flu. People have been terrorized with rumors of invisible plague. Such hysteria explains why advanced nations are reporting such a dire pandemic while poorer nations without medical protection or testing equipment have not reported any crisis, no corpses in the streets. Not having changed to counting deaths "with Covid" rather than "of Covid" pursuant to the new CDC guidelines may have helped keep their death numbers down and so they are unaware of a pandemic danger not being experienced.

[B] Dr. Hodkinson's "greatest hoax ever perpetrated" is now proven by the data. More and more doctors are speaking up.

[C] It is not "nothing more than a bad Flu." The original Covid 3.4% CFR made it a third as Bad as the Flu 10% CFR but its new 1% CFR Light makes it only a tenth as bad.

[D] 166 deaths in non-long-term care at 230,000:1 (0.00044%) is very close to deaths for under 65s at 300,000:1 (0.00033%). His odds are in the ball park with the right number of zeros.

108. On Dec 2 2020, Facebook labels Hodkinson's speech false:

Pathologist falsely claims COVID-19 is "the greatest hoax ever perpetrated" and "just another bad flu." a AP ASSESSMENT: False. Not only is COVID-19 deadlier than the flu, but symptoms can be long-lasting, according to medical experts. But health officials widely agree that the coronavirus is much more dangerous than the flu. "This [COVID-19] is very different from influenza, much higher mortality, [A] much higher morbidity if you survive it," [B] said Ostrosky-Zeichner...

109. [A] "health officials widely agree that the coronavirus is much more dangerous than the flu" only if comparing Covid's CFR to the hundredfold too small Flu's IFR.

[B] A tenth of the Flu's mortality is not "much higher mortality!"

110. On Dec 22 2020, Dr. Sucharit Bhakdi Vaccine Warning

Americans and people all over the world are rushing to be the first in line to get one of the new COVID vaccines. This is despite the fact that the risks associated with the vaccines could be worse than the coronavirus itself. [A]

Much of the United States and the world has been shut down over a virus that has more than a 99% survivability rate. [B] In fact, the virus is so tame, most people never even know they have it.

And yet we continue to see business closures, lockdowns, quarantines, mask mandates, and social distancing rules. As a result of these devastating government actions, we've seen skyrocketing unemployment, suicide, drug abuse, and crime. In fact, in San Francisco, the deaths from suicide have far outpaced the deaths from COVID. Yet we're told this is all part of the "new normal" and we should expect it to go on - not for months - but years.

<https://deepstatejournal.com/2020/12/22/world-renowned-microbiologist-has-urgent-warning-about-covid-vaccines/>

111. With the Apple-Orange amplification of the Covid threat by a hundredfold is exposed, Dr. Hodkinson, Dr. Bhakdi and many other doctors protesting the hoax are proven right and have been defamed by Big Brother at AP and Facebook. Too many doctors have avowed in public that Covid is a tame virus and the numbers back them up to expose the Covid 19 scamdemic.

#### ONTARIO LOCKS DOWN

112. On January 12 2021, the Ontario Premier Doug Ford declared a second provincial emergency under s 7.0.1 (1) of the Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act (EMPCA) to address the Covid Crisis and Save Lives. The Province issues Stay-at-Home Order and Introduces Enhanced Enforcement Measures to Reduce Mobility for the looming threat of the collapse of the province's hospital system shown by models. Stay-at-home unless for

groceries, pharmacy, health care, exercise, work if can't do remotely with no more than 5 people meeting to help stop the spread by reducing mobility as the province continues its vaccine rollout and ramps up to mass vaccination.

<https://news.ontario.ca/en/release/59922/ontario-declares-second-provincial-emergency-to-address-covid-19-crisis-and-save-lives>

113 In the 6 months between Jan 15 to July 13, for children under 20, Ontario reported 1 Death! Ontario schools are closed for 1 death? Extrapolation expects 3 deaths under 20 in Canada.

<https://files.ontario.ca/moh-covid-19-report-en-2020-07-26.pdf>

#### CANADA THREATENS IMPRISONMENT

114. On Jan 5 2021, Prime Minister Justin Trudeau warned:  
We've been very clear. No one should be vacationing abroad right now. But if you still decide to travel at your own risk, you will need to show a negative Covid 19 test before you return [A]. You must self-isolate for 2 weeks when you get back [B]. You need to take this seriously [C]. Not following the rules can mean real consequences including fines and prison time. [D]

115. [A] Showing a negative Covid test given the PCR test's propensity for false positives may be a problem. No fun being locked in over a false positive. The CDC is now expected to require the same hard-to-show negative Covid test from international visitors to the US.

[B] With zero reported transmission without symptoms, quarantining returning people without sniffles is not logical.

[C] It is very hard to take anything seriously from a government fooled by an Apple-Orange Comparison.

[D] A duped Prime Minister wants to fine and imprison those refusing to be fooled with him.



116. All the world's elected politicians fell for the Apple-Orange Comparison and only Guinness Record never-elected-100-times politician John Turmel did not.

117. The Prime Minister and his Government have been duped by the most elementary trick in statistics, comparing apples to oranges to exaggerate the threat by a hundredfold, duped by an unproven theory of asymptomatic transmission of a virus with only 166 Canadians not in Long-Term-Care dying up to Nov 15 2020; a Population Fatality Rate for Canadians not in Long-Term-Care of a mere 0.00044%, 1 in 230,000.

118. Government-mandated Covid-Mitigation restrictions on civil rights imposed under such delusions are unconstitutionally per incuriam. Restrictions on civil liberties are not warranted for a Covid threat if they are not warranted for the tenfold deadlier Flu threat. The restrictions are focused on the long-shots with a 0.00044% (1/230,000) chance of death and not on those shorter shots in Long-Term-Care with  $10,781/38M = 0.03\%$  (1/3,300). A third of the Flu's 1/1,000.

WHO DID IT?!

119. Global effects of lockdown restrictions have caused

- desperation deaths far in excess of Covid deaths;
- hundreds of millions unemployed;
- 250 million facing famine around the world.

120. What kind of evil cabal would use global media and medical establishments to hype a mini-virus a hundredfold

with an Apple-Orange comparison into an imaginary plague to convince a gullible world into shutting down life-support systems and imposing famine on a quarter billion people and innumerable woes on many hundreds of millions more? Why condemn so many to death on a cross of hype? Qui bono? Who benefits? Personal Protection Equipment producers, Skip-the-Dishes delivery come to mind but vaccine companies seem to have most to gain by an exaggerated scandemic.

#### MANDATORY VACCINE PROTECTION SCAM

121. It would seem all the hype is promoting vaccines to get immunity cards for release from house arrest. Los Angeles just announced students will be required to get Covid vaccine before returning to school.

122. Without comment on the validity of tests for any particular vaccine, it is the untested combinations of many vaccines that are worrisome. When a new vaccine is added to the approved schedule, the formula for the number of combinations to test is  $2^n$  for "n" vaccines, an exponential geometric doubling with each additional new vaccine.

123. With  $n=10$  vaccines, there are  $2^{10} = 1,024$  combinations to test for clashes, from a test of none to a test of all ten, with all other combinations in between. Add an 11th vaccine and where there were 1,024 combinations without it, there now need to be tested another 1,024 combinations with it. The original 1024 without plus the next 1024 with.  $2^{11} = 2,048!$  Another vaccine doubles the number of combinations to be tested again to  $2^{12}$ , 4,096 combinations. 20 vaccines have  $2^{20} =$  over 1,000,000 combinations to test.

124. Vaccine promotion has the hallmarks of a scam which is always exposed by its illogic. The vaccinated who feel threatened by the unvaccinated are like someone with an umbrella worried about you getting them wet because you don't have an umbrella too. It's too stupid an argument to take seriously but it is the argument at the base of mandatory vaccines. The delusion that the protected are threatened by the unprotected. It belies the belief that vaccines work. If they work, why is protection needed from unvaccinated others? These are the health officials who put fluoride, a known neuro-toxin, into our water? Can they be trusted to put anything into our veins?

#### PREFERENCE FOR ALTERNATIVES TO VACCINES

125. Some would prefer to follow Biblical Injunctions to "fast" and "drink the waters of your own cistern." Searches for "Immunity" and "fast" will show a 3-day fast rejuvenates the whole immune system. Searches for "urine therapy" will find Miracle Water heals innumerable ailments. It is attested that swishing for 2 days disinfected and healed a root canal infection, one of the most dangerous and painful infections known, a medical miracle.

[https://www.youtube.com/playlist?feature=edit ok&list=PLYEOvpWV5TtU Uqr2dTTg3iHg3u JLf8u](https://www.youtube.com/playlist?feature=edit_ok&list=PLYEOvpWV5TtU Uqr2dTTg3iHg3u JLf8u)

126. Drinking the waters of your own cistern have allowed a 28-day fast with no discomfort losing 20 pounds; a 4-month fast feasting once a week losing 48 pounds! Weecycling all vitamins, minerals, enzymes, hormones, DNA and stem cells seems to cut the hunger while the body cannibalizes the bad unnecessary or malignant cells during the starvation.

127. Adding in vitamins and supplements, some would prefer to dare a few days in bed obtaining new antibodies for natural immunity with medical care a call away if things get bad.

#### BANK OF CANADA FOR DAMAGES RELIEF

128. It should not be thought that payment to citizens damaged by the Covid-mitigation restrictions would be impossible for the Canada to pay. <http://SmartestMan.Ca/1974> explains how federal and provincial governments once had access to interest-free loans at the Bank of Canada until 1974 when Pierre Trudeau forced governments to become indebted by borrowing from private banks at interest. There is no reason Canada could not borrow enough new interest-free credits from the Bank of Canada to cover the damage with all Canada's payments going against principal. <http://SmartestMan.Ca/bankmath>

129. If compensation to all aggrieved Canadians averaged \$50,000, for 38 million Canadians, that's almost \$2 trillion Canada should owe to cover it all. Noting that Canada paid over \$2 trillion in debt service over 45 years, if \$2 trillion taxed to pay debt service owed to private banks was possible to pay over 45 years, \$2T taxed to pay reparations owed to the central bank can also be paid over 45 years with no payment schedule necessary and the rest of government history to pay it back. Should it take on average \$100,000 to compensate every Canadian, it could take 90 years for government to atone for the statistical incompetence shown being duped by an Apple-to-Orange comparison.

## ORDER SOUGHT PRESENT AND FUTURE

130. Upon the grounds of the threat of Covid exaggerated a hundredfold, the theory of Asymptomatic Transmission not being documented, the 0.00044% Population Fatality Rate for Canadians not in Long-Term-Care being miniscule, Plaintiff seeks:

A) a Declaration that the Government of Canada's Covid-mitigation restrictions on Charter rights are arbitrary and constitutionally unreasonable;

B) an Injunction prohibiting any federal Covid-mitigation restrictions that are not imposed on the deadlier Flu; or

C) a permanent constitutional exemption from any Covid-mitigation restrictions;

D) an Order for an appropriate and just remedy for damages incurred by such unconstitutional restrictions on rights for pain and losses including the

- 1) stress and concern suffered;
- 2) family and friend connections damaged;
- 3) inconvenience and time lost in line-ups;
- 4) higher expected prices for Covid Mitigation Measures.

The Plaintiff proposes this action be tried in the City of Toronto, Province of Ontario.

Dated at Toronto on Jan 19 2021.

*JC Turmel*

---

John C. Turmel, B.Eng.,  
50 Brant Ave.,  
Brantford, N3T 3G7,  
Tel/Fax: 519-753-5122,  
Cell: 519-717-1012  
Email: johnturmel@yahoo.com

TO: Registrar of this Court  
Attorney General for Canada

File No: T-130-21

FEDERAL COURT

BETWEEN:

JOHN C. TURMEL

Plaintiff

and

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

Defendant

STATEMENT OF CLAIM

(Pursuant to S.48 of  
the Federal Court Act)

For the Plaintiff:

John C. Turmel, B.Eng.,

50 Brant Ave.,

Brantford, N3T 3G7,

Tel/Fax: 519-753-5122,

Cell: 519-717-1012

Email: johnturmel@yahoo.com

**TAB 3**



Court File No.: T-130-21

**FEDERAL COURT**

B E T W E E N :

**JOHN C. TURMEL**Plaintiff  
(Responding Party)

and

**HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN**Defendant  
(Moving Party)

---

**AFFIDAVIT OF DEBORAH TELESFORD**

---

I, Deborah Telesford, of the Town of Caledonia, in the Province of Ontario  
**AFFIRM THAT:**

1. I am a paralegal in the Litigation, Extradition and Advisory Division of the Ontario Regional Office of the Department of Justice. In that capacity, I have reviewed the litigation files associated with the plaintiff, Mr. John C. Turmel (the “Plaintiff Turmel”).

**A. PREVIOUS COSTS AWARDS AGAINST THE PLAINTIFF**

2. The Federal Court, Federal Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court of Canada have previously ordered the Plaintiff to pay Canada’s costs in the following matters:

<b>Style of Cause</b>	<b>Court</b>	<b>Court File No.</b>	<b>Order / Discontinuance Date</b>	<b>Amount</b>
<i>John C Turmel v HMQ</i>	Federal Court	T-448-14	Nov 5, 2015	\$250
<i>John C Turmel v HMQ</i>	Federal Court of Appeal	A-342-14	Jan 13, 2016	\$3,350
<i>John Turmel v HMQ</i>	Supreme Court of Canada	36937	Jun 23, 2016	\$807.86 (certificate of taxation issued November 30, 2016)
<i>John C Turmel v HMQ</i>	Federal Court	T-561-15	May 12, 2016	\$6,105.03 (certificate of assessment issued May 17, 2018)
<i>John Turmel v HMQ</i>	Supreme Court of Canada	37647	Nov 23, 2017	\$877.70 (certificate of taxation issued February 7, 2018)
<i>John C Turmel v HMQ</i>	Federal Court	T-1932-18	Jan 2, 2019	\$450 (certificate of assessment issued Apr 21, 2020)
<b>TOTAL</b>				\$11,840.59
<b>TOTAL with post-judgment interest as of May 21, 2021</b>				<b>\$13,003.39</b>

Copies of these costs orders, certificates of assessment, and certificates of taxation are attached as **Exhibits “A”, “B”, “C”, “D”, “E” and “F”** respectively.


3. These costs remain unpaid. The total amount owed by the plaintiff to Canada as of May 21, 2021, inclusive of post-judgment interest calculated in accordance with

section 37(1) of the *Federal Courts Act* and section 129 of the *Courts of Justice Act* (Ontario) is \$13,003.39.

**B. THE ANTICIPATED COSTS OF THE CURRENT ACTION**

4. In responding to this claim, I anticipate that Canada will incur \$11,350 in costs, inclusive of disbursements. These anticipated costs are based on Column III of Tariff B of the *Federal Courts Rules*. A bill of anticipated costs showing these calculations is attached as **Exhibit “G”**.

Affirmed before me by video conference from the Town of Caledonia in the County of Haldimand, to the City of Toronto in the Province of Ontario, on May 20, 2021.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Commissioner for Taking Affidavits

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
DEBORAH TELESFORD

This is **Exhibit "A"** referred to in  
the Affidavit of

**Deborah Telesford**

AFFIRMED before me this 20<sup>th</sup> day  
of May, 2021

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
A Commissioner, etc.

Federal Court



Cour fédérale

Date: 20151106

Docket: T-488-14

Ottawa, Ontario, November 6, 2015

**PRESENT: The Honourable Mr. Justice Phelan****BETWEEN:****JOHN C. TURMEL****Plaintiff****and****HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN IN RIGHT OF  
CANADA****Defendant****ORDER**

**UPON MOTION** by the Plaintiff for leave to lift the Stay Order (May 7, 2014) in respect of his Statement of Claim and to proceed with his Motion for Summary Judgment;

**AND UPON** the Court having ordered that motions to lift a stay are to proceed by way of Rule 369 motion;

**AND UPON CONSIDERING** that:

1. section 50(3) of the *Federal Courts Act* gives the Court the discretion to lift a stay;

2. the discretion to lift the stay should take into consideration whether the facts are “substantially different from the facts upon which the original disposition was made” (*Del Zotto v Canada (Minister of National Revenue - MNR)*, [1996] FCJ No 294/*Murphy v Compagnie Amway Canada*, 2014 FCA 136);
3. the Applicant has not shown any substantial change of facts upon which the stay order was made;
4. the *Allard* trial is complete, final submissions were concluded in July and a decision is pending;
5. the Plaintiff is, in effect, attempting to re-litigate the stay order in the face of a pending appeal; and
6. there is no proper basis for lifting the stay of proceedings.

**THIS COURT ORDERS that** this motion be dismissed with costs payable forthwith of \$250.00.

“Michael L. Phelan”

---

Judge

This is **Exhibit "B"** referred to in  
the Affidavit of

**Deborah Telesford**

AFFIRMED before me this 20<sup>th</sup> day  
of May, 2021

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "R. J. [unclear]", is written over a horizontal line.

A Commissioner, etc.

Federal Court of Appeal



Cour d'appel fédérale

Date: 20160113

Docket: A-342-14

Toronto, Ontario, January 13, 2016

CORAM: PELLETIER J.A.  
STRATAS J.A.  
GLEASON J.A.

BETWEEN:

JOHN C. TURMEL

Appellant

and

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

Respondent

JUDGMENT

The appeal is dismissed with costs fixed in the amount of \$3,350, all inclusive.

“J.D. Denis Pelletier”

J.A.



This is **Exhibit "C"** referred to in  
the Affidavit of

**Deborah Telesford**

AFFIRMED before me this 20<sup>th</sup> day  
of May, 2021

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "R. J. [unclear]", written over a horizontal line.

A Commissioner, etc.

Supreme Court of Canada



Cour suprême du Canada



No. 36937

**BETWEEN:**

John Turmel

Applicant

- and -

Her Majesty the Queen

Respondent

**ENTRE :**

John Turmel

Demandeur

- et -

Sa Majesté la Reine

Intimée

I hereby certify that the costs of the respondent have been taxed and allowed in the sum of eight hundred seven dollars and eighty-six cents (\$807.86).

Je certifie par les présentes que les frais de l'intimée ont été taxés et que leur montant a été fixé à huit cent sept dollars et quatre-vingt-six cents (807,86\$).

REGISTRAR OF THE  
SUPREME COURT OF CANADA

REGISTRAIRE DE LA  
COUR SUPRÊME DU CANADA

Dated this 30th day of November 2016.

Fait le 30e jour de novembre 2016.

This is **Exhibit "D"** referred to in  
the Affidavit of

**Deborah Telesford**

AFFIRMED before me this 20<sup>th</sup> day  
of May, 2021

  
A Commissioner, etc.

Federal Court



Cour fédérale

Date: 20180517

Docket: T-561-15

**BETWEEN:****JOHN TURMEL****Plaintiff****and****HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN IN RIGHT OF  
CANADA****Defendant****CERTIFICATE OF ASSESSMENT OF COSTS**

**UPON** the Order and Reasons signed by the Court on May 12, 2016, dismissing the action, with costs;

**AND UPON** the bill of costs filed February 23, 2018, and amended on March 18, 2018;

**AND UPON** the directions issued and served on February 26, 2018, informing the parties that the assessment of costs would proceed in writing and of the deadline to file materials and representations;

**AND UPON CONSIDERING** the material in support of the bill of costs as well as the written representations on costs;

**AND UPON CONSIDERING** that no other representations were received by the Registry of the Court, nor were any requests to extend the time to file submissions;

**AND UPON CONSIDERING** the decision in *Dahl v Canada*, 2007 FC 192, in which it is stated at paragraph 2:

Effectively, the absence of any relevant representations by the Plaintiff, which could assist me in identifying issues and making a decision, leaves the bill of costs unopposed. My view, often expressed in comparable circumstances, is that the *Federal Courts Rules* do not contemplate a litigant benefiting by an assessment officer stepping away from a position of neutrality to act as the litigant's advocate in challenging given items in a bill of costs. However, the assessment officer cannot certify unlawful items, i.e. those outside the authority of the judgment and the Tariff.

**AND UPON HAVING CONSIDERED** the above referenced comments and the lack of challenge by the opposing party, I have reviewed the file and the materials submitted;

**AND UPON HAVING CONCLUDED** that the assessable services claimed under Tariff B of the *Federal Courts Rules* are reasonable;

**AND UPON HAVING CONCLUDED** that the disbursements claimed were all necessary charges for the conduct of this matter and that the amounts claimed are reasonable;

**I HEREBY CERTIFY** that the bill of costs presented by the Defendant is assessed and allowed at \$6,105.03.

**"Johanne Parent"**

---


Assessment Officer

CERTIFIED AT TORONTO, ONTARIO, this 17<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2018.

This is **Exhibit "E"** referred to in  
the Affidavit of

**Deborah Telesford**

AFFIRMED before me this 20<sup>th</sup> day  
of May, 2021

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "R. J. J.", is written over a horizontal line.

A Commissioner, etc.

Supreme Court of Canada



Cour suprême du Canada



No. 37647

**BETWEEN:**

John Turmel

Applicant

- and -

Her Majesty the Queen

Respondent

**ENTRE :**

John Turmel

Demandeur

- et -

Sa Majesté la Reine

Intimée

I hereby certify that the costs of the respondent have been taxed and allowed in the sum of eight hundred seventy-seven dollars and seventy cents (\$877.70).

Je certifie par les présentes que les frais de l'intimée ont été taxés et que leur montant a été fixé à huit cent soixante-dix-sept dollars et soixante-dix cents (877,70 \$).

**REGISTRAR OF THE  
SUPREME COURT OF CANADA**

**REGISTRAIRE DE LA  
COUR SUPRÊME DU CANADA**


Dated this 7th day of February 2018.

Fait le 7e jour de février 2018.

This is **Exhibit "F"** referred to in  
the Affidavit of

**Deborah Telesford**

AFFIRMED before me this 20<sup>th</sup> day  
of May, 2021

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "R. J.", written over a horizontal line.

A Commissioner, etc.



Federal Court



Cour fédérale

Date: 20200421

Docket: T-1932-18

**BETWEEN:****JOHN C. TURMEL****Plaintiff****and****HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN****Defendant****CERTIFICATE OF ASSESSMENT**

**I HEREBY CERTIFY that the** Defendant's Bill of Costs has been assessed and allowed  
in the amount of \$450.00.

\_\_\_\_\_  
"Garnet Morgan"  
Assessment Officer

**CERTIFIED AT TORONTO, ONTARIO, this 21<sup>st</sup> day of April 2020.**

This is **Exhibit "G"** referred to in  
the Affidavit of

**Deborah Telesford**

AFFIRMED before me this 20<sup>th</sup> day  
of May, 2021

  
A Commissioner, etc.

Court File No.: T-130-21

**FEDERAL COURT**

BETWEEN :

**JOHN C. TURMEL**Plaintiff  
(Responding Party)

and

**HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN**Defendant  
(Moving Party)

---

**BILL OF ANTICIPATED COSTS OF THE DEFENDANT**

---

A claim for fees is being made with respect to:

COUNSEL FOR THE RESPONDENT

Benjamin Wong (Year of Call – 2019)

**FEES:**

<b><u>ITEM</u></b>	<b><u>ASSESSMENT SERVICE</u></b>	<b><u>COLUMN III UNITS</u></b>	<b><u>UNITS CLAIMED</u></b>	<b><u>FEE</u></b>
	<b>A. Originating documents and Other Pleadings</b>			
A2	Preparation and filing of all defences, replies, counterclaims or respondents' records and materials.	4-7	6	\$900

	<b>C. Discovery and Examinations</b>			
C7	Discovery of documents, including listing, affidavit and inspection.	2-5	4	\$600
C8	Preparation for an examination, including examinations for discovery, on affidavits, and in aid of execution.	2-5	4	\$600
C9	Attending on examinations, per hour.	0-3	12 2 units x 6 hours (1 day)	\$1800
	<b>D. Pre-Trial and Pre-Hearing Procedures</b>			
D13	Counsel fee:  (a) preparation for trial or hearing, whether or not the trial or hearing proceeds, including correspondence, preparation of witnesses, issuance of subpoenas and other services not otherwise particularized in this Tariff; and	2-5	4	\$600
	<b>E. Trial or Hearing</b>			
E14	Counsel fee:  (a) to first counsel, per hour in Court; and	2-3	12 2 units x 6 hours (1 day)	\$1,800
E15	Preparation and filing of written argument, where requested or permitted by the Court.	3-7	5	\$750
	<b>HST (not payable by the Federal Crown )</b>			\$0.00
	<b>Total Estimated Fees:</b>		<b>47 units</b>	<b><u>\$7,050.00</u></b>

	<b><u>ANTICIPATORY DISBURSEMENTS (inclusive of HST)</u></b>	<b><u>FEE</u></b>
	Court reporter attendance fees and transcripts, for Plaintiff's and Defendant's discovery	\$4,300
	<b>Total Estimated Disbursements:</b>	<b><u>\$4,300.00</u></b>

**TOTAL ANTICIPATED FEES AND DISBURSEMENTS: \$11,350.00**

**TAB 4**

Court File No.: T-130-21

**FEDERAL COURT**

BETWEEN:

**JOHN TURMEL**Plaintiff  
(Responding Party)

and

**HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN**Defendant  
(Moving Party)

---

**WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS OF THE DEFENDANT**(Motion to Strike or for Security For Costs)

---

**Attorney General of Canada**Department of Justice  
Ontario Regional Office  
120 Adelaide Street West, Suite #400  
Toronto, Ontario M5H 1T1

Per: Benjamin Wong

Tel: 647-256-0564

Fax: 416-952-4518

E-mail: benjamin.wong2@justice.gc.ca

Counsel for the Defendant

## Contents

OVERVIEW .....	1
PART I – STATEMENT OF FACTS.....	1
A. The Claim .....	1
B. Existing Costs Awards Against The Plaintiff .....	5
PART II – POINTS IN ISSUE .....	6
PART III – SUBMISSIONS.....	6
A. The Court Should Strike The Claim Without Leave To Amend .....	6
1) No Jurisdiction To Grant Relief In Relation To Provincial COVID-19 Measures .....	6
2) The Claim Discloses No Reasonable Cause of Action .....	8
3) The Claim Is Scandalous, Frivolous, and Vexatious.....	13
4) Leave To Amend Should Be Refused .....	15
B. If The Claim Is Not Struck, The Plaintiff Should Be Ordered To Provide Security For Costs.....	16
PART IV – ORDER SOUGHT .....	17
PART V – Authorities Cited.....	19



## OVERVIEW

1. The plaintiff alleges that the federal Government's COVID-19 mitigation measures infringe several of his Charter rights, but has failed to identify a federal measure that has personally affected him. This claim should be struck without leave to amend for want of jurisdiction, failing to disclose a reasonable cause of action, and being scandalous, frivolous, and vexatious.

2. The majority of the measures identified in the claim are provincial measures. To the extent that federal measures are engaged, the plaintiff has also failed to plead material facts concerning his personal circumstances or to explain how his Charter rights are engaged. Instead of pleading material facts, the claim is replete with irrelevant and incomprehensible statements as well as spurious, extreme and scandalous allegations.

3. If the claim is not struck without leave to amend, the plaintiff should be required to pay security for costs. Canada has six costs awards against the plaintiff that remain unpaid. Canada has a *prima facie* right to security for costs in these circumstances, and the plaintiff has not shown that the Court should exercise discretion not to award security in this case.

## PART I – STATEMENT OF FACTS

### A. THE CLAIM

4. This claim is one of more than 60 virtually identical claims that purport to seek relief related to the Government of Canada's COVID-19 mitigation measures. The claim seeks:

- (a) a declaration that the federal government's COVID-19 mitigation measures infringe sections 2(c) and (d), 6, 7, 8, 9, and 12 of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* ("Charter") and are not saved by section 1 of the Charter;

- (b) an order pursuant to subsection 24(1) of the Charter prohibiting any COVID restriction measures “that are not imposed on the deadlier Flu”;
- (c) a permanent constitutional exemption from any such measures; and
- (d) an order for “unspecified damages for pain and losses incurred” as a result of stress, damaged personal connections, inconvenience and time lost in line-ups, and higher prices.<sup>1</sup>

5. The claim alleges that the World Health Organization is exaggerating COVID-19 fatality rates, and that only 1 in 230,000 Canadians have died of COVID-19.<sup>2</sup> It alleges that COVID-19 is a “man-made virus, albeit a very mild one,” and that most COVID-19 deaths were in long-term care homes.<sup>3</sup> It alleges that asymptomatic transmission of COVID-19 is rare, and provides several paragraphs of statistics comparing COVID-19 mortality rates to those associated with the flu.

6. The claim alleges a “cover up” to “fudge the statistical Cases and Fatalities data.”<sup>4</sup> It refers to alleged changes by the American Centres for Disease Control and Prevention to its death certificate guidelines, as well as an effort by the mainstream media to suppress “HydroxyChloroQuine HCQ” as an alternative to “a Bill Gates-funded Oxford Recovery HCQ test”, which the claim alleges is “deliberate malevolence.”<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Order of the Court dated April 26, 2021 in *Duncan Paterson v Her Majesty the Queen* (Court File No.: T-263-21) at para 1, **Canada’s Book of Authorities [CBOA], Tab 30**; Claim at paras 1, 130, **Canada’s Motion Record [CMR], Tab 2 at 5-6, 47**.

<sup>2</sup> Claim at para 2, **CMR, Tab 2 at 6**.

<sup>3</sup> Claim at paras 6-70, **CMR, Tab 2 at 8-28**.

<sup>4</sup> Claim at paras 71-96, **CMR, Tab 2 at 29-35**.

<sup>5</sup> Claim at paras 74-79, 87-96, **CMR, Tab 2 at 29-31, 33-35**.

7. The claim alleges that social media platforms, such as Twitter, Facebook, Youtube, and Disqus, have “instituted draconian censorship policies,”<sup>6</sup> and that doctors protesting COVID-19 measures are being “defamed by Big Brother at [the Associated Press] and Facebook.”<sup>7</sup>

8. The claim alleges that “Covid-Mitigation restrictions include lockdowns & curfews, quarantines, mandatory masks, mandatory social distancing, mandatory vaccine, mandatory immunity card for public services.”<sup>8</sup> It alleges that “lockdown gain does not justify lockdown pain” and that lockdown measures are not supported by evidence, and have increased “suicides, murders, abuses, addictions, [and] truancy.”<sup>9</sup>

9. The claim alleges that COVID measures have resulted in line-ups at stores, higher prices, stress, neighbours “snitching” on neighbours, and lost friendships due to “accusations of deniers putting alarmists at risk from the invisible plague,”<sup>10</sup> and that:

Such restrictions on civil liberties to mitigate a sham-virus are an arbitrary, grossly disproportional, conscience-shocking violation of the Charter Section 2 right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association is gone, S.6 right to [m]obility, S.7 right to life, liberty and security, S.8 right to be secure against unreasonable search or seizure, S.9 right to not to be arbitrarily detained or imprisoned, S.12 right to not be subjected to any cruel and unusual treatment or punishment, not in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice.<sup>11</sup>

10. The claim specifically refers to the Ontario government’s declaration of an emergency and “Stay-At-Home” order enacted under s 7.0.1(1) of the provincial

---

<sup>6</sup> Claim at paras 97-102, **CMR, Tab 2 at 36-37.**

<sup>7</sup> Claim at paras 106-111, **CMR, Tab 2 at 39-41.**

<sup>8</sup> Claim at paras 103-105, **CMR, Tab 2 at 37-38.**

<sup>9</sup> Claim at para 103, **CMR, Tab 2 at 37.**

<sup>10</sup> Claim at para 103, **CMR, Tab 2 at 37.**

<sup>11</sup> Claim at para 104, **CMR, Tab 2 at 38.**

*Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act*, and alleges that Ontario has closed schools despite only one COVID-19 death among children under 20 between January 15 and July 13, 2020.<sup>12</sup>

11. The claim refers to a statement by the Prime Minister describing the requirements for international travellers arriving by air to produce a negative COVID-19 test before entering Canada, for all travellers to quarantine upon entering Canada, and the potential for “fines and prison time” for not following these requirements.<sup>13</sup> It alleges that “The Prime Minister and his Government have been duped,” and that “Restrictions on civil liberties are not warranted for a Covid threat if they are not warranted for the tenfold deadlier Flu threat.”<sup>14</sup>

12. The claim asks the rhetorical question “Who benefits?,” and alleges that “Personal Protection Equipment producers, Skip-the-Dishes delivery come to mind but vaccine companies seem to have most to gain by an exaggerated scamdemic.”<sup>15</sup>

13. The claim alleges that the vaccine promotion is a “scam”, and that some would prefer alternatives including “drinking the waters of your own cistern”, vitamins, and supplements.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Claim at paras 112-113, **CMR, Tab 2 at 41- 42**; *Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act*, [RSO 1990 c E.9](#), s 7.0.1(1), **CBOA, Tab 3**; *Declaration of Emergency*, [O Reg 7/21](#), **CBOA, Tab 2**; *Stay-At-Home Order*, [O Reg 11/21](#), Schedule 1, s 1(1) [Ontario Stay-At-Home Order], **CBOA, Tab 9**; *Rules For Areas In Stage 1*, [O Reg 82/20](#), Schedule 3, s 3(1) (January 15, 2021) [Ontario Stage 1 OIC], **CBOA, Tab 8**.

<sup>13</sup> Claim at para 114, **CMR, Tab 2 at 42**.

<sup>14</sup> Claim at paras 117-118, **CMR, Tab 2 at 43**.

<sup>15</sup> Claim at paras 119-120, **CMR, Tab 2 at 43- 44**.

<sup>16</sup> Claim at paras 121-127, **CMR, Tab 2 at 44- 46**.

14. The claim also alleges that the government owes Canadians \$2 trillion in compensation, which it could pay by borrowing “new interest-free credits from the Bank of Canada.”<sup>17</sup>

## **B. EXISTING COSTS AWARDS AGAINST THE PLAINTIFF**

15. The Federal Court, Federal Court of Appeal, and the Supreme Court of Canada have previously ordered the plaintiff to pay Canada’s costs in six separate proceedings, totalling \$11,840.59:<sup>18</sup>

- (a) **FC File No.: T-488-14:** the Federal Court dismissed the plaintiff’s motion to lift the stay of his Charter challenge to Canada’s medical cannabis regulations, with costs of \$250;<sup>19</sup>
- (b) **FCA File No.: A-342-14:** the Federal Court of Appeal dismissed the plaintiff’s appeal of a Federal Court decision staying his challenge to Canada’s medical cannabis regulations, with costs of \$3,350;<sup>20</sup>
- (c) **SCC File No.: 36937:** the Supreme Court of Canada dismissed the plaintiff’s application for leave to appeal the Federal Court of Appeal decision in A-342-14, with costs that were later assessed at \$807.86;<sup>21</sup>
- (d) **FC File No.: T-561-15:** the Federal Court dismissed the plaintiff’s constitutional challenge to the *Canada Elections Act*, and granted summary judgment in favour of Canada, with costs of \$6,105.03. An appeal of this decision was later dismissed for delay in Federal Court of Appeal File No. A-202-16;<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Claim at paras 128-129, **CMR, Tab 2 at 46.**

<sup>18</sup> Affidavit of Deborah Telesford affirmed May 20, 2021 at para 2 [Telesford Affidavit], **CMR, Tab 3 at 50.**

<sup>19</sup> Order of the Court dated November 6, 2015, in *John C Turmel v Her Majesty the Queen* (Court File No.: T-488-14).

<sup>20</sup> *John C Turmel v Her Majesty the Queen*, [2016 FCA 9](#) at paras 5-7, 27, **CBOA, Tab 20.**

<sup>21</sup> *Turmel v R*, [\[2016\] SCCA No 125](#), **CBOA, Tab 49.**

<sup>22</sup> *John Turmel v Her Majesty the Queen*, 2016 FC 532 at paras 1, 13-17, **CBOA, Tab 21**; Order of the Federal Court of Appeal in *John Turmel v Her Majesty the Queen* (Court File No.: A-202-16), **CBOA, Tab 34.**

- (e) **SCC File No.: 37647:** the Supreme Court of Canada dismissed the plaintiff's application for leave to appeal the Federal Court of Appeal decision in A-202-16, with costs that were later assessed at \$877.70;<sup>23</sup>
- (f) **FC File No.: T-1932-18:** the plaintiff discontinued his Charter challenge to Canada's medical cannabis regulations. Costs of the discontinued action were subsequently assessed at \$450.<sup>24</sup>

16. These cost awards remain unpaid, and the total outstanding, including post-judgment interest is currently \$13,003.39.<sup>25</sup>

## **PART II – POINTS IN ISSUE**

17. The issues in this motion are:
- (a) Should the claim be struck, without leave to amend?
  - (b) If the claim is not struck without leave to amend, should the plaintiff be ordered to provide security for costs?

## **PART III – SUBMISSIONS**

### **A. THE COURT SHOULD STRIKE THE CLAIM WITHOUT LEAVE TO AMEND**

#### **1) No Jurisdiction To Grant Relief In Relation To Provincial COVID-19 Measures**

18. Of the COVID-19 measures specifically identified in the claim, only the pre-flight testing requirement for travellers entering Canada by air and 14-day quarantine

---

<sup>23</sup> *R v Turmel*, [\[2017\] SCCA No 262](#), CBOA, Tab 40.

<sup>24</sup> *Turmel v Canada*, [2020 FC 537](#) at para 1, CBOA, Tab 48.

<sup>25</sup> Telesford Affidavit at paras 2-3, CMR, Tab 3 at 50-51.

requirement for all international travellers are federal measures.<sup>26</sup> While this Federal Court has clear jurisdiction to grant relief in respect of these measures, as detailed below, the claim does not contain facts capable of establishing that these measures infringe the plaintiff's Charter rights.

19. However, this Court lacks jurisdiction to grant relief in respect of the other measures specifically identified in the claim. This includes Ontario's "Stay-At-Home" and school-closure orders,<sup>27</sup> which are provincial and clearly beyond this Court's jurisdiction.<sup>28</sup> The claim also refers generally to "lockdowns & curfews, quarantines, mandatory masks, mandatory social distancing, mandatory vaccine, mandatory immunity card for public services."<sup>29</sup> Although the claim not identify any specific measures matching some of these descriptions, insofar as these measures exist for the general public – for example, the requirement to wear mask in retail settings in

---

<sup>26</sup> Claim at para 114, **CMR, Tab 2 at 42**; *Minimizing the Risk of Exposure to COVID-19 in Canada Order (Quarantine, Isolation and Other Obligations)*, [OIC 2021-0001](#), ss 1.1(3), 3 [Quarantine Act OIC], **CBOA, Tab 6**; [Interim Order Respecting Certain Requirements for Civil Aviation Due to COVID-19, No. 18](#), s 35(1) [Transport Canada Interim Order], **CBOA, Tab 5**.

<sup>27</sup> Claim at paras 112-13, **CMR, Tab 2 at 41-42**; Ontario Stay-At-Home Order, Schedule 1, s 1(1), **CBOA, Tab 9**; Ontario Stage 1 OIC, Schedule 3, s 3(1), **CBOA, Tab 8**.

<sup>28</sup> *Lessard-Gauvin v Canada (Attorney General)*, [2016 FC 418](#) at para 20 [Lessard-Gauvin], **CBOA, Tab 23**; *Toney v Royal Canadian Mounted Police*, [2013 FCA 217](#) at para 10, **CBOA, Tab 47**; *Feeney v R*, [2020 CarswellNat 4891](#) at paras 16, 17, 23, **CBOA, Tab 17**.

<sup>29</sup> Claim at para 103, **CMR, Tab 2 at 37**.

Ontario,<sup>30</sup> or Quebec's former curfew requirement<sup>31</sup> – they are also provincial or municipal measures and are similarly beyond this Court's jurisdiction.<sup>32</sup>

## 2) The Claim Discloses No Reasonable Cause of Action

20. It is fundamental to the trial process that a plaintiff plead material facts in sufficient detail to support the claim and relief sought.<sup>33</sup> A statement of claim must tell the defendant who, when, where, how and what gave rise to liability, and plead the constituent elements of each cause of action.<sup>34</sup> A claim that fails to plead the necessary material facts will be struck for disclosing no reasonable cause of action.<sup>35</sup>

21. As noted by the Federal Court of Appeal in *Mancuso*, courts and opposing parties cannot be left to speculate as to how facts might be arranged to support a cause of action.<sup>36</sup> It is “fundamental to the trial process that a plaintiff plead material facts in sufficient detail to support the claim and relief sought”, in order to enable issues and relevant evidence to be identified and enable the defendant to respond to the allegations.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> Ontario Stage 1 OIC, Schedule 3, s 3.1, **CBOA, Tab 8**.

<sup>31</sup> *Ordering of measures to protect the health of the population amid the COVID-19 pandemic situation*, [OIC 2-2021](#), **CBOA, Tab 7**.

<sup>32</sup> While the federal government has adopted targeted COVID-19 mitigation measures in specific contexts, such as medical isolation measures for inmates in federal correctional institutions ([Commissioner's Directive 822: Medical Isolation and Modified Routine for COVID-19](#)), the plaintiff does not suggest that he is personally affected by any of these measures and the claim does not appear to challenge them, **CBOA, Tab 1**.

<sup>33</sup> *Mancuso v Canada (National Health and Welfare)*, [2015 FCA 227](#) at para 16 [Mancuso], **CBOA, Tab 25**.

<sup>34</sup> Mancuso at paras 16 to 21, **CBOA, Tab 25**.

<sup>35</sup> Mancuso at para 27, **CBOA, Tab 25**.

<sup>36</sup> Mancuso at para 16, **CBOA, Tab 25**.

<sup>37</sup> Mancuso at paras 16 and 17, **CBOA, Tab 25**.



22. The importance of material facts is heightened in Charter cases. The Supreme Court of Canada has cautioned that Charter decisions must not be made in a factual vacuum and that the pleading of sufficient material facts is essential to a proper and contextual consideration of the Charter issues.<sup>38</sup> It is “essential to the proper presentation of Charter issues” that a plaintiff plead sufficient material facts to satisfy the criteria applicable to each alleged Charter infringement as defined by the Supreme Court of Canada in its case law.<sup>39</sup>

23. Courts have also emphasized the importance of the individual plaintiff’s circumstances in Charter cases. Plaintiffs cannot rely on facts applicable to other individuals to support an alleged infringement of their individual Charter rights, and it is instead incumbent on the plaintiff to demonstrate that the elements of each alleged Charter infringement are met in their individual circumstances.<sup>40</sup>

24. Finally, while courts must generally accept the facts pleaded as true for the purposes of a motion to strike, they are not required to accept speculation, bald allegations or conclusory statements of law dressed up as facts.<sup>41</sup> Rule 181 requires particularization of every allegation, especially for allegations of malice or fraudulent intention.<sup>42</sup> Plaintiffs are also not permitted to make broad allegations in hopes of later

---

<sup>38</sup> *Reference re Same-Sex Marriage*, [2004 SCC 79](#) at para 51, **CBOA, Tab 42**; Mancuso at para 32, **CBOA, Tab 25**.

<sup>39</sup> Mancuso at para 21, **CBOA, Tab 25**; *MacKay v Manitoba*, [\[1989\] 2 SCR 357](#) at para 9, **CBOA, Tab 24**.

<sup>40</sup> *Harris v Canada (Attorney General)*, [2019 FCA 232](#) at para 22 [Harris 2019], **CBOA, Tab 18**.

<sup>41</sup> *Operation Dismantle Inc v Canada*, [\[1985\] 1 SCR 441](#) at paras 27, 29, **CBOA, Tab 29**; Mancuso at para 17, **CBOA, Tab 25**; *Sivak v Canada*, [2012 FC 272](#) at para 91, **CBOA, Tab 44**.

<sup>42</sup> *Merchant Law Group v Canada Revenue Agency*, [2010 FCA 184](#) at para 35 [Merchant], **CBOA, Tab 27**.

discovering facts to support them or to file inadequate pleadings and rely on the defendant to request particulars.<sup>43</sup>

25. The claim fails to meet these basic requirements of pleadings. While it alleges that COVID-19 measures have resulted in harms such as “suicides, murders, abuses, addictions, [and] truancy,” “stress from the distress shown by many,” and “neighbours snitching on neighbours,” it provides no material facts that establish a link between COVID-19 measures and the harms alleged, nor does it allege that the plaintiff has personally suffered these harms.<sup>44</sup>

26. To the extent that the plaintiff is alleging that COVID-19 measures have infringed the rights of others, he also does not meet any of the requirements for public-interest standing. In deciding whether to grant public-interest standing, the Supreme Court of Canada has held that courts should have regard to (1) whether the claim raises a serious justiciable issue, (2) whether the plaintiff has a genuine interest in the outcome, and (3) whether the proceeding is a reasonable and effective way to bring the issue before the courts.<sup>45</sup> The plaintiff does not meet any of these requirements, and with respect to the third factor in particular, there is no reason why the Charter issues cannot instead be raised instead by an individual personally suffering from the harms alleged.

27. As detailed below, the claim also does not contain material facts to satisfy the essential elements of any of the specific Charter infringements alleged.

---

<sup>43</sup> Mancuso at para 20, **CBOA, Tab 25**.

<sup>44</sup> Claim at para 103, **CMR, Tab 2 at 37**.

<sup>45</sup> *Canada (Attorney General) v Downtown Eastside Sex Workers United Against Violence Society*, [2012 SCC 45](#) at paras 2, 37, **CBOA, Tab 12**.

28. **Freedom of peaceful assembly (Charter s 2(c)):** The claim does not identify a federal measure that has directly prevented the plaintiff from peacefully assembling with others.<sup>46</sup>

29. **Freedom of association (Charter s 2(d)):** The claim does not identify a federal measure that has directly prevented the plaintiff from joining with others to form associations, pursue other constitutional rights, or meet on more equal terms the power and strength of other groups or entities.<sup>47</sup>

30. **Mobility rights (Charter s 6):** The claim does not allege that the plaintiff has been personally prevented from entering, remaining in, or leaving Canada, or from moving to or working in another Canadian province.<sup>48</sup> Although the claim refers to the federal pre-flight testing and 14-day quarantine requirements which have applied to travellers entering Canada since at least January 2021, the plaintiff does not allege that he has travelled internationally during this time or that he plans to do so anytime in the near future.<sup>49</sup>

31. **Right to life, liberty and security of the person (Charter s 7):** The claim does not put forward any facts capable of demonstrating that any federal measures deprive the plaintiff of life, liberty, or security of the person, or that any such deprivation is inconsistent with the principles of fundamental justice.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> *Roach v Canada*, [\[1994\] FCJ No 33](#) at para 51, **CBOA, Tab 43**.

<sup>47</sup> *Mounted Police Association of Ontario v Canada (Attorney General)*, [2015 SCC 1](#) at para 66, **CBOA, Tab 28**.

<sup>48</sup> *Divito v Canada (Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness)*, [2013 SCC 47](#) at para 17, **CBOA, Tab 16**.

<sup>49</sup> Claim at paras 114-115, **CMR, Tab 2 at 42**.

<sup>50</sup> *Canada (Attorney General) v Bedford*, [2013 SCC 72](#) at paras 57-58, **CBOA, Tab 11**.

32. For the purposes of the present motion, Canada accepts that the requirement to quarantine for 14 days after returning to Canada from an international destination engages an individual's liberty interests. However, as noted above, the claim does not allege that the plaintiff has travelled internationally during this time or that he plans to do so anytime in the near future.<sup>51</sup>

33. While the claim also broadly alleges that COVID-19 measures have caused stress and seeks damages in relation to this stress,<sup>52</sup> it provides no material facts concerning the psychological impact of COVID-19 measures on the plaintiff personally, let alone facts sufficient to show a "serious and profound effect" on his psychological integrity, which would be required to engage security of the person.<sup>53</sup>

34. **Unreasonable search and seizure (Charter s 8):** The claim does not identify any federal measures that authorize a search or seizure, and does not allege that the plaintiff has been personally subject to such a search or seizure.<sup>54</sup>

35. **Arbitrary detention or imprisonment (Charter s 9):** The claim does not allege that the plaintiff has been detained or imprisoned pursuant to any federal measures.<sup>55</sup> The Supreme Court of Canada has held that not every interaction with the state will amount to the detention, and that a detention requires "significant physical or psychological restraint."<sup>56</sup> Although the claim refers to the quarantine requirement

---

<sup>51</sup> *Canadian Constitution Foundation v Attorney General of Canada*, [2021 ONSC 2117](#) at para 18 [CCF], **CBOA, Tab 15**; see also *Spencer v Canada (Attorney General)*, [2021 FC 361](#) at para 61, **CBOA, Tab 45**.

<sup>52</sup> Claim at paras 103, 130, **CMR, Tab 2 at 37, 47**.

<sup>53</sup> *Blencoe v British Columbia (Human Rights Commission)*, [2000 SCC 44](#) at paras 81-82, **CBOA, Tab 10**.

<sup>54</sup> *R v Tessling*, [2004 SCC 67](#) at para 18, **CBOA, Tab 39**.

<sup>55</sup> *R v Grant*, [2009 SCC 32](#) at paras 44, 54-55, **CBOA, Tab 35**.

<sup>56</sup> *R v Le*, [2019 SCC 34](#) at para 27, **CBOA, Tab 36**.

applicable to international travellers arriving in Canada, it does not allege or contain facts capable of establishing that this requirement constitutes such a restraint, or that the plaintiff has been personally affected by it. Furthermore, in *Canadian Constitutional Foundation et al v Attorney General of Canada* [CCF], the Ontario Superior Court of Justice recently held that “the claim that quarantine is arbitrary detention... is frivolous” when denying a motion for an interlocutory injunction against mandatory hotel quarantine measures.<sup>57</sup>

36. **Cruel and unusual punishment (Charter s 12):** The claim does not contain any facts capable of demonstrating punishment or treatment that is grossly disproportionate in the sense that it outrages standards of decency and is abhorrent or intolerable to society.<sup>58</sup> Indeed, in CCF, the Ontario Superior Court of Justice also held that “the claim that quarantine... is cruel and unusual punishment is frivolous.”<sup>59</sup>

37. Instead of the material facts to support the causes of action alleged, the claim contains an array of bald and irrelevant assertions, opinions, and conclusions. Absent these material facts, it is plain and obvious that the claim cannot succeed. Accordingly, the Court should find that the claim fails to disclose a reasonable cause of action.

### 3) **The Claim Is Scandalous, Frivolous, and Vexatious**

38. A claim will be struck for being scandalous, frivolous, and vexatious if it:

- (a) is so deficient in relevant material facts that the defendant cannot know how to answer;<sup>60</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> CCF at para 39, **CBOA, Tab 15**.

<sup>58</sup> *R v Lloyd*, [2016 SCC 13](#) at para 24, **CBOA, Tab 37**.

<sup>59</sup> CCF at para 39, **CBOA, Tab 15**

<sup>60</sup> Mancuso at para 17, **CBOA, Tab 25**.

- (b) includes statements that are irrelevant, incomprehensible, and inserted for colour;<sup>61</sup>
- (c) is replete with extreme and scandalous allegations that are unsubstantiated;<sup>62</sup> or
- (d) is overly-long, unwieldy and repetitive.<sup>63</sup>

39. Prolivity, repetition and the bare pleading of a series of events are not substitutes for the requirement to plead material facts so that a defendant can understand and defend the allegations.<sup>64</sup> Although the claim is 43 pages, it is almost entirely devoid of material facts concerning either the measures being challenged or how the plaintiff is personally affected by these measures.<sup>65</sup>

40. Instead of providing material facts, the claim is replete with irrelevant and incomprehensible statements as well as spurious, extreme and scandalous allegations. For example, the claim includes:

- (a) lengthy allegations against third parties such as the World Health Organization, Dr. Anthony Fauci, Bill Gates, Facebook, Youtube, and the Province of Ontario;<sup>66</sup>
- (b) references to COVID-19 as a “sham-virus,” “Shamdemic,” “exaggerated plague” and “scamdemic;”<sup>67</sup>
- (c) allegations such as “The only way to cover up when deaths do not match exaggerated expectations is to fudge the statistical Cases and Fatalities

---

<sup>61</sup> *Reference re Charter of Rights and Freedoms, s 52(1)*, [2017 FC 30](#) at paras 40-41 [Turmel Kit Reference], **CBOA, Tab 41**.

<sup>62</sup> *R v Mennes*, [2004 FC 1731](#) at para 78, **CBOA, Tab 38**.

<sup>63</sup> *Wang v Canada*, [2016 FC 1052](#) at para 31 [Wang], **CBOA, Tab 50**.

<sup>64</sup> Wang at para 31, **CBOA, Tab 50**.

<sup>65</sup> *Kisikawpimootewin v Canada*, [2004 FC 1426](#) at para 8, **CBOA, Tab 22**.

<sup>66</sup> See for example, Claim at paras 6, 37, 56, 96-98, 112-113, **CMR, Tab 2 at 8, 15, 23, 35-38, 41-42**.

<sup>67</sup> Claim at para 71, 104, 106, 111, 120, **CMR, Tab 2 at 29, 38, 39, 41, 43-44**.

data,” “the Prime Minister and his Government have been duped” and “It’s the same persuasion technique as Global Warming;”<sup>68</sup> and

- (d) lengthy diatribes, such as “What kind of evil cabal would use global media and medical establishments to hype a mini-virus a hundredfold with an Apple-Orange comparison into an imaginary plague to convince a gullible world into shutting down life-support systems and imposing famine on a quarter billion people and innumerable woes on many hundreds of millions more? Why condemn so many to death on a cross of hype? Qui bono? Who benefits? Personal Protection Equipment producers, Skip-the-Dishes delivery come to mind but vaccine companies seem to have most to gain by an exaggerated scandemic.”<sup>69</sup>

41. Contrary to the rules of pleading, the claim is “unwieldy and non-compliant,” and utterly fails to set out a concise statement of material facts in support of the plaintiff’s causes of action.<sup>70</sup> Accordingly, the Court should find that the claim is scandalous, vexatious, and frivolous.

#### 4) Leave To Amend Should Be Refused

42. This claim should be struck without leave to amend. The Federal Courts have previously struck several claims filed either by the plaintiff or by others relying on his litigation “kits,” on the grounds that the claims failed to disclose a reasonable cause of action or were scandalous, frivolous and vexatious.<sup>71</sup> The present claim suggests the

---

<sup>68</sup> Claim at para 70, **CMR, Tab 2 at 28**.

<sup>69</sup> Claim at paras 37, 120, **CMR, Tab 2 at 15-16, 43-44**.

<sup>70</sup> Mancuso at para 12, **CBOA, Tab 25**.

<sup>71</sup> Turmel Kit Reference at paras 4, 12, 38-41, 44 (striking 316 claims, including the plaintiff’s claim with Court File No.: T-488-14), **CBOA, Tab 41**; Order of the Court dated October 11, 2016 in *Hathaway v Her Majesty the Queen* (Court File No.: T-983-16), **CBOA, Tab 33**; Order of the Court dated October 11, 2016, in *Macdonald et al v Her Majesty the Queen* (Court File No.: T-1113-16), **CBOA, Tab 32**; *Spottiswood v Her Majesty the Queen*, [2019 FC 553](#) at paras 56-57, 96, **CBOA, Tab 46**; Harris 2019 at paras 3, 4, 19-20, 23-24, **CBOA, Tab 18**; *Canada v Mozajko*, [2021 FCA 25](#) at paras 2, 10, **CBOA, Tab 14**; *Canada v Harris*, [2020 FCA 124](#) at paras, 26-43, 50 [Harris 2020], **CBOA, Tab 13**.

plaintiff has not heeded the Court's guidance in those decisions concerning the elements of proper pleading and that the defects in the present claim would not be remedied by further amendments.<sup>72</sup>

**B. IF THE CLAIM IS NOT STRUCK, THE PLAINTIFF SHOULD BE ORDERED TO PROVIDE SECURITY FOR COSTS**

43. If the claim is not struck in its entirety without leave to amend, Canada requests that the plaintiff be ordered to provide security for costs prior to taking any further steps in this action. Canada also requests that security be fixed at \$11,350.00, which reflects Canada's anticipated costs and disbursements of this action should it proceed.<sup>73</sup>

44. Pursuant to Rule 416(1)(f) of the *Federal Courts Rules*, the Court may order the plaintiff to provide security for the defendant's costs where the defendant has a costs order against the plaintiff that remains unpaid.<sup>74</sup>

45. Canada has six unpaid costs orders against the plaintiff totalling \$13,003.39, including post-judgment interest.<sup>75</sup> On this basis, Canada has a *prima facie* right to security for costs and the only remaining question is whether the Court should exercise its discretion under Rule 417 to refuse security.<sup>76</sup>

46. Rule 417 provides that the Court may refuse to order security for costs if a plaintiff demonstrates impecuniosity and the Court is of the opinion that the case has merit. Neither requirement is met in this case.

---

<sup>72</sup> Harris 2020 at para 47, **CBOA, Tab 13**.

<sup>73</sup> Telesford Affidavit, Exhibit "G", **CMR, Tab 3 at 67**.

<sup>74</sup> Rules, Rule 416(f), **CBOA, Tab 4**.

<sup>75</sup> Telesford Affidavit at paras 2-3, Exhibits "A", "B", "C", "D", "E" and "F", **CMR, Tab 3 at 53-66**.

<sup>76</sup> *Mapara v Canada (Attorney General)*, [2016 FCA 305](#) at para 5, **CBOA, Tab 26**.



47. The Federal Court of Appeal has distinguished impecuniosity from merely having insufficient assets.<sup>77</sup> The onus is on the plaintiff seeking to establish impecuniosity to demonstrate not only that the plaintiff's own assets are insufficient, but also that the plaintiff is unable to raise the money elsewhere, such as by borrowing from family or others.<sup>78</sup> The impracticality of accessing money from other sources must be supported by material evidence and established by the plaintiff with robust particularity.<sup>79</sup>

48. In the present case, the plaintiff has provided no evidence whatsoever concerning his financial circumstances, let alone evidence sufficient to establish that he cannot pay the outstanding costs awards or borrow or access funds from another source. He accordingly has not established that he is impecunious.

49. With respect to merit, Canada also relies on its submissions in the paragraphs above that the Court lacks jurisdiction over most of the measures identified, and that the claim discloses no reasonable cause of action, and is scandalous, vexatious, and frivolous. There is accordingly no reason for the Court to refuse security for costs in this case.

#### **PART IV – ORDER SOUGHT**

50. For these reasons, Canada requests an Order:
- (a) striking the claim without leave to amend; or
  - (b) in the alternative, an order requiring the plaintiff to provide security for costs in the amount of \$11,350, and not take any further steps in the action until security for costs is provided;

---

<sup>77</sup> *Heli Tech Services (Canada) Ltd v Weyerhaeuser Company*, [2006 FC 1169](#), paras 6-8, **CBOA, Tab 19**; Mapara, paras 8, 13-14, **CBOA, Tab 26**.


<sup>78</sup> Mapara at paras 13-14, **CBOA, Tab 26**.

<sup>79</sup> Mapara at paras 13-14, **CBOA, Tab 26**.

- (c) the costs of this motion and of the action, fixed at \$1,000; and
- (d) such further and other relief as this Honourable Court may allow.

**ALL OF WHICH IS RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED**

Dated at Toronto this June 7, 2021.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**Attorney General of Canada**  
Department of Justice  
Ontario Regional Office  
120 Adelaide Street West, Suite #400  
Toronto, Ontario M5H 1T1

Per: Benjamin Wong

Tel: 647-256-0564

Fax: 416-952-4518

E-mail: benjamin.wong2@justice.gc.ca

Counsel for the Defendantt

TO: The Administrator  
Federal Court of Canada

AND TO: John C. Turmel  
50 Brant Avenue  
Brantford, Ontario N3T 3G7

Plaintiff, self represented

**PART V – AUTHORITIES CITED**

- 1 *Blencoe v British Columbia (Human Rights Commission)*, [2000 SCC 44](#)
- 2 *Canada (Attorney General) v Bedford*, [2013 SCC 72](#)
- 3 *Canada (Attorney General) v Downtown Eastside Sex Workers United Against Violence Society*, [2012 SCC 45](#)
- 4 *Canada v Harris*, [2020 FCA 124](#)
- 5 *Canada v Mozajko*, [2021 FCA 25](#)
- 6 *Canadian Constitution Foundation v Attorney General of Canada*, [2021 ONSC 2117](#)
- 7 *Divito v Canada (Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness)*, [2013 SCC 47](#)
- 8 *Feeney v R*, [2020 CarswellNat 4891](#)
- 9 *Harris v Canada (Attorney General)*, [2019 FCA 232](#)
- 10 *Heli Tech Services (Canada) Ltd v Weyerhaeuser Company*, [2006 FC 1169](#)
- 11 *John C Turmel v Her Majesty the Queen*, [2016 FCA 9](#)
- 12 *John Turmel v Her Majesty the Queen*, 2016 FC 532
- 13 *Kisikawpimootewin v Canada*, [2004 FC 1426](#)
- 14 *Lessard-Gauvin v Canada (Attorney General)*, [2016 FC 418](#)
- 15 *MacKay v Manitoba*, [\[1989\] 2 SCR 357](#)
- 16 *Mancuso v Canada (National Health and Welfare)*, [2015 FCA 227](#)
- 17 *Mapara v Canada (Attorney General)*, [2016 FCA 305](#)
- 18 *Merchant Law Group v Canada Revenue Agency*, [2010 FCA 184](#)
- 19 *Mounted Police Association of Ontario v Canada (Attorney General)*, [2015 SCC 1](#)
- 20 *Operation Dismantle Inc v Canada*, [\[1985\] 1 SCR 441](#)
- 21 Order of the Court dated April 26, 2021 in *Duncan Paterson v Her Majesty the Queen* (Court File No.: T-263-21)

- 22 Order of the Court dated November 6, 2015, in *John C Turmel v Her Majesty the Queen* (Court File No.: T-488-14)
- 23 Order of the Court dated October 11, 2016, in *Macdonald et al v Her Majesty the Queen* (Court File No.: T-1113-16)
- 24 Order the Court dated October 11, 2016 in *Hathaway v Her Majesty the Queen* (Court File No.: T-983-16)
- 25 Order of the Federal Court of Appeal in *John Turmel v Her Majesty the Queen* (Court File No.: A-202-16)
- 26 *R v Grant*, [2009 SCC 32](#)
- 27 *R v Le*, [2019 SCC 34](#)
- 28 *R v Lloyd*, [2016 SCC 13](#)
- 29 *R v Mennes*, [2004 FC 1731](#)
- 30 *R v Tessling*, [2004 SCC 67](#)
- 31 *R v Turmel*, [\[2017\] SCCA No 262](#)
- 32 *Reference re Charter of Rights and Freedoms, s 52(1)*, [2017 FC 30](#)
- 33 *Reference re Same-Sex Marriage*, [2004 SCC 79](#)
- 34 *Roach v Canada*, [\[1994\] FCJ No 33](#)
- 35 *Sivak v Canada*, [2012 FC 272](#)
- 36 *Spencer v Canada (Attorney General)*, [2021 FC 361](#)
- 37 *Spottiswood v Her Majesty the Queen*, [2019 FC 553](#)
- 38 *Toney v Royal Canadian Mounted Police*, [2013 FCA 217](#)
- 39 *Turmel v Canada*, [2020 FC 537](#)
- 40 *Turmel v R*, [\[2016\] SCCA No 125](#)
- 41 *Wang v Canada*, [2016 FC 1052](#)