

John C. Turmel, B.Eng.,
50 Brant Ave.,
Brantford, N3T 3G7,
Tel/Fax: 519-753-5122, Cell: 226-966-4754
Email: johnturmel@yahoo.com

Tuesday Mar 2 2021

VIA EMAIL

Chief Administrator
Courts Administration Service
fc_reception_cf@cas-satj.gc.ca

Dear Sir or Madam:

re: John Turmel v. HMTQ T-130-21

Could you please place this letter before Case Management
Judge Aylen:

"The parties shall, by no later than March 5, 2021,
provide their availability for a case management
conference (by Zoom - audio only) during the week of
March 8, 2021.

The purpose of the case management conference will be to
address the following:

(a) Whether the parties consent to T-130-21 being the
lead file, with the balance of the files held in
abeyance and bound by the outcome of any determinations
in T-130-21.

I cannot advise the other plaintiffs to be bound by the
outcome of any determination of the Lead Plaintiff's
original T-130-21 file.

In the ongoing "delsc" claims for damages due to grow permit
processing delays before Justice Brown, any time any
additional facts or arguments appeared, they was
incorporated into later Statement of Claim templates.

Later "delsc2" Statements claimed not just the cannabis that was not produced during the delay but also added the lost site rent.

Later Statements claimed for the restitution of the processing time subtracted off the permit which was adjudicated when Judge Brown permitted the Lead Plaintiff's claim be amended to the updated version.

The latest "delsc8" claim included an affirmation that the Court of Appeal found lacking. Both an original delsc and an updated delsc8 edition are still before Judge Brown.

So I cannot advise anyone to be bound by a persuasive decision on an original claim when there is a good chance later claims will be improved.

I will advise any plaintiffs who can't attend the zoom call to email their consent to a stay pending a decision on the Lead Plaintiff but not to be bound by it.

(b) The timetable for the Crown's motion to strike.

(c) The timetable for the Crown's motion for security for costs (if necessary)."

I have no comment on timetables other than to follow the timetables in the rules.

Other issues not yet addressed are:

a) Canada's request for leave to seek relief by way of a single motion to one plaintiff and not the others that would be applicable to all of the proceedings has been consented to as long as the other plaintiffs receive all documentation by email before ceding right to be served personally with relevant documents. I would further ask that the Court order that Defendant provide Lead Plaintiff with the list of plaintiff emails, say once a week.

b) The Defendant notes the parties may also require other procedural directions as the parties may also require other procedural directions as these claims unfold, that case-management would also be consistent with the Court's approach to past claims downloaded from the same website as the current claims.

The past approach was to email the document to the Defendant, Efile it, and under service, submit a pdf of the metadata from "sent" email, and thirdly upload a letter requesting Judge Brown okay the email metadata rather than an affidavit of service. He always granted use of the metadata. I would ask the Court keep Steps 1 and 2 but skip Step 3, a letter to the judge asking to allow the metadata.

c) The Defendant notes some plaintiffs have previous unpaid judgments and ask that security be posted. Considering the no-cash cost of emailing out a copy of the documentation, those plaintiffs could then decide if it is worth putting up security after the first case is decided.

Dated at Brantford on Tuesday Mar 2 2021.



John C. Turmel

Cc: benjamin.wong2@justice.gc.ca,
treeoflifemission@yahoo.ca,
biafiaslemon@gmail.com,
pcfix911@hotmail.com,
nathan.inniss@protonmail.com,
robinsonritchiewilliam@gmail.com,
omegawayne@gmail.com,
tleadley@telus.net,
thebraunsolution@gmail.com