Federal Court  Cour fédérale

Date: 20221109

Docket: T-962-22

Citation: 2022 FC 1526

Ottawa, Ontario, November 9, 2022

PRESENT: The Honourable Mr. Justice Fothergill

BETWEEN:

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA

Applicant

and

JOHN C. TURMEL

Respondent

JUDGMENT AND REASONS

I. Overview

[1] The Attorney General of Canada [AGC] has brought an application under s 40 of the *Federal Courts Act*, RSC 1985, c F-7 for an Order declaring John C. Turmel to be a vexatious litigant. The AGC asks that Mr. Turmel be prohibited from instituting or continuing litigation in this Court without leave, and proposes the imposition of additional measures to regulate his

conduct before this Court. These measures include the payment of all outstanding costs awards and a prohibition on providing assistance to other litigants.

[2] As required by s 40(2) of the *Federal Courts Act*, the AGC's delegate has consented to this application in writing.

[3] Mr. Turmel has instituted numerous meritless and repetitive proceedings before this Court, the Federal Court of Appeal, the Ontario Courts, and the Supreme Court of Canada. He has brought proceedings for improper purposes, frequently sought to re-litigate matters decided previously, made scandalous allegations against members of the courts and other parties, refused to follow the *Federal Courts Rules*, SOR/98-106 [Rules], and failed to pay costs orders.

[4] Despite having no qualifications or apparent ability to practise law, Mr. Turmel has developed litigation "kits" comprising templates for court documents, and has recruited others to "flood the courts" with these documents.

[5] Mr. Turmel responded to this application without the benefit of legal advice or representation. He did not challenge the evidence relied on by the AGC through cross-examination, or adduce any evidence of his own. At the hearing of the application, he continued to express contempt for the judiciary, maintaining that any judge who disagrees with him is simply wrong.

[6] Mr. Turmel does not object to the imposition of a leave requirement before commencing further proceedings in this Court. He says he is unlikely to develop further litigation "kits" unless the government imposes new vaccination mandates.

[7] For the reasons that follow, Mr. Turmel is declared to be a vexatious litigant. He must pay all outstanding costs awards issued by this Court, and obtain leave before instituting or continuing any litigation in this Court. He is also prohibited from aiding or abetting others to initiate proceedings in this Court.

II. Background

[8] According to the affidavit evidence submitted by the AGC, Mr. Turmel has instituted at least 67 court proceedings since 1980. This includes 20 claims and applications in this Court, 13 appeals to the Federal Court of Appeal [FCA], 18 applications and appeals in the Ontario courts, and 17 applications for leave to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada [SCC]. The proceedings have concerned a wide range of legal issues, and have been almost entirely unsuccessful.

[9] Mr. Turmel's proceedings have been dismissed as failing to disclose reasonable causes of action, as wholly unsupported by evidence, as attempts to re-litigate matters previously decided, or as otherwise frivolous and vexatious and abuses of process.

A. *Proceedings Commenced by Mr. Turmel*

[10] Mr. Turmel's numerous legal proceedings may be divided into the following categories.

(1) Banking Proceedings

[11] In 1981, Mr. Turmel filed an unsuccessful application in this Court for an order that the Bank of Canada cease and desist the "genocidal practice of interest" (T-896-81). Both the FCA (A-136-81) and the SCC (17314) dismissed Mr. Turmel's attempts to appeal.

[12] In 1982, the County Court of Ontario allowed an action by the Toronto Dominion Bank against Mr. Turmel, and granted judgment in the amount of $2,813.19. After unsuccessfully appealing to the Ontario Court of Appeal [ONCA], Mr. Turmel also unsuccessfully sought leave to appeal to the SCC based on the assertion that the interest charged by banks violates natural, biblical or criminal laws (18329).

(2) Elections Proceedings

[13] Mr. Turmel is a perennial candidate in municipal, provincial and federal elections, and holds the Guinness World Record for the most elections contested and lost. He has commenced numerous court proceedings related to his candidacy in these elections.

[14] Mr. Turmel has instituted 12 proceedings against the Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission and several broadcasters concerning their allocation of free political broadcast time or his exclusion from broadcasted debates. Of these proceedings, 11 were dismissed (T-5329-80, T-2883-83, T-2884-83, T-1516-84, 300/84, T-798-85, T-799-85, T-1716-87, T-1717-87, A-451-07 and 09-A-19) and one was stayed for non-payment of court costs (1827/90). Mr. Turmel's appeals to the FCA were dismissed or abandoned (A-912-80, A-13-84, A-955-84), and his applications for leave to appeal to the SCC were dismissed (19099 and 33319).

[15] In 2015, Mr. Turmel brought an action in this Court for a declaration that the expense audit provisions of the *Canada Elections Act*, SC 2000, c 9, infringed his right under s 3 of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* [Charter] to participate as a candidate in federal elections (T-561-15). The action, an appeal to the FCA (A-202-16), and an application for leave to appeal to the SCC (37646) were all dismissed.

(3) Gaming Proceedings

[16] Mr. Turmel has commenced multiple legal proceedings in relation to Canada's gaming laws. In 1981, he unsuccessfully applied to this Court for an Order compelling the Crown to prosecute the retail chain Simpsons-Sears for selling playing cards, which Mr. Turmel alleged were prohibited gaming devices (T-3-81).

[17] In 1993, Mr. Turmel was criminally charged for keeping a gaming house and subsequently convicted by the Ontario Court of Justice (93-18193). His appeal to the ONCA (C21516) and application for leave to appeal to the SCC (25610) were both dismissed.

(4) Canadian Broadcasting Corporation Proceedings

[18] In 2010, Mr. Turmel brought two libel actions against the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in the Ontario Superior Court of Justice [OSCJ] (CV-10-48 and CV-699-2010) arising from his appearance on the television program Dragon's Den. The actions, appeals to the ONCA (CFN 52849 and C53732), and an application for leave to appeal to the SCC (34882) were all dismissed.

(5) Cannabis Proceedings

[19] Mr. Turmel has brought or helped others to bring numerous constitutional challenges to Canada's cannabis laws. In 2001, Mr. Turmel was charged with contempt for violating a publication ban issued by the Quebec Superior Court (550-01003994). Mr. Turmel also brought a motion for a declaration that the marihuana prohibitions in the *Controlled Drugs and Substances Act*, SC 1996, c 19 [CDSA], infringed s 7 of the Charter, which was dismissed.

[20] In 2002 and 2003, Mr. Turmel brought two unsuccessful applications in the OSCJ for Orders declaring that the marihuana provisions of the CDSA were unconstitutional (573/3003

and 133-2003). The applications, appeals to the ONCA (C39740 and C39653), and an application for leave to appeal to the SCC (30570) were all dismissed.

[21] In 2003, Mr. Turmel was charged with possession of marihuana for the purposes of trafficking. In the course of his prosecution, he brought three applications in the OSCJ challenging the constitutionality of the CDSA marihuana provisions. These applications, the appeals to the ONCA (C40127, C44587, C44588) and applications for leave to appeal to the SCC (32011 and 32012) were all dismissed. Mr. Turmel was ultimately convicted, and all of his attempts to appeal, together with related motions, were dismissed by the ONCA (C45295, M45479, M45751) and the SCC (32013 and 37064).

[22] Mr. Turmel frequently purports to provide legal assistance to others charged with marihuana offences. Between 2008 and 2014, at least four accused persons relied on court materials or legal strategies developed by Mr. Turmel to bring applications challenging the constitutionality of the CDSA marihuana provisions. The OSCJ dismissed each of these applications.

(6) COVID-19 Proceedings

[23] In January 2021, Mr. Turmel filed a claim in this Court alleging that Canada's COVID-19 public health measures infringed the Charter (T-130-21). He asserted that COVID-19 was an "imaginary plague", and the resulting deaths were greatly exaggerated by an "evil cabal" that includes the World Health Organization. On July 21, 2021, Prothonotary Mandy Aylen (as she

then was) struck Mr. Turmel's claim without leave to amend. Subsequent appeals of this decision were dismissed by both this Court and the FCA (A-286-21).

[24] On February 16, 2022, Mr. Turmel filed a claim challenging the constitutionality of Canada's vaccination requirements for air travellers (T-277-22). This Court struck the claim without leave to amend.

B. *Mr. Turmel's Litigation Kits*

[25] Since 2014, Mr. Turmel has prepared and distributed litigation "kits" comprising templates for initiating legal claims. These have been used by other litigants to file more than 800 claims, nearly all of which have been dismissed or are in the process of being dismissed as failing to disclose reasonable causes of action, or as otherwise frivolous, vexatious or abuses of process. Several of these litigants are subject to costs awards, many of which remain unpaid.

[26] Mr. Turmel candidly admits that his litigation kits are ineffective. According to the AGC:

> In still other [social media] posts, Mr. Turmel acknowledges that his kit proceedings lack merit, but explains why he nevertheless brings them. In a 2014 post, he acknowledged that his challenge to the *Marihuana Medical Access Regulations* had been rendered moot by the repeal of those regulations, but explained that he was proceeding with his challenge "to smear [Health Canada] with their own dirt. These are malevolent government gremlins and I'm about to really light a fire under their asses."
>
> In another post concerning the Turmel Kit 150-gram claims, Mr. Turmel explained that "People ask me why I keep fighting so many loser fights. It's because I love ruining the careers of the judges and Crowns who get added to the History Wall of MedPot

> shame." After this court struck the Turmel Kit MMAR-MMPR claims, Mr. Turmel similarly used social media to announce that he would appeal, noting that "Sure, the chances are slim but I enjoy exposing judicial failures to their bosses."

[27] Mr. Turmel also admits that he encourages plaintiffs to use his litigation kits to "flood the courts". According to the AGC:

> In social media posts, Mr. Turmel has described his development and distribution of litigation kits as part of an intentional strategy to overwhelm the courts and the Crown. He invites plaintiffs to "clog up," "flood," "swamp," "semi-paralyze" or "ream out" the Federal Court registry with a "tidal wave" or "avalanche" of claims or requests for documents.
>
> In a July 2016 post promoting the Turmel Kit [marihuana] juice and oil claims, Mr. Turmel explained that "The real winning power is once again what freaked out both the Crown and the Registry last time, the volume." In a December 2018 post concerning a proposed challenge to the *Criminal Code* drug-impaired driving provisions, he similarly explained that "There is only [one] way to fight back and that's through mass action in the courts."
>
> In other posts, Mr. Turmel uses militaristic or violent language to characterize his litigation strategy. He describes himself as a "guerilla lawyer" and invites his kit users (whom he has described as an "army of goldstars," in reference to the gold-coloured seal placed on Federal Court claims) to "sap the defences" of the court and Crown and file claims and "get in on the kill."

[28] Using Mr. Turmel's kits, litigants have filed or attempted to file hundreds of substantially identical proceedings challenging various aspects of Canada's medical cannabis regulatory regime, including:

(a) 315 actions, including one by Mr. Turmel (T-488-14), challenging the former *Marihuana Medical Access Regulations* and *Marihuana for Medical Purposes Regulations*;

(b) 19 motions for extensions of time to appeal the decision of this Court in *Allard v Canada*, 2014 FC 1260;

(c) nine actions, including one by Mr. Turmel (T-1932-18), for declarations that the CDSA infringes s 7 of the Charter by failing to provide access to cannabis juice and oil for medical purposes;

(d) 393 actions challenging the processing time for registration with Health Canada to produce cannabis for personal medical use;

(e) 36 actions challenging the 150-gram public limit on public possession and shipping of cannabis for medical purposes;

(f) four actions challenging the requirement for annual healthcare practitioner authorization to use cannabis for medical purposes;

(g) one action challenging Health Canada's rejection of a plaintiff's application for registration to produce cannabis for personal medical use; and

(h) one action challenging the production site requirements for producing cannabis for personal medical use, and one action challenging criminal record requirements.

[29] Of these roughly 770 proceedings, at least 657 were struck or dismissed by the Federal Courts. The remainder were discontinued, not accepted for filing, or remain subject to outstanding requests by the AGC for dismissal.

[30] Mr. Turmel has also developed litigation kits to challenge Canada's COVID-19 public health measures. Similar to Mr. Turmel's claim in T-130-21, one kit instructs plaintiffs to allege that Canada's COVID-19 mitigation measures infringe the Charter. Based on this kit, approximately 80 self-represented plaintiffs have filed substantially identical claims in this Court. These were stayed pending the outcome of Mr. Turmel's appeal of T-130-21 to the FCA, which was dismissed on October 4, 2022 (*Turmel v Canada*, 2022 FCA 166).

[31] Similar to his claim in T-277-22, another one of Mr. Turmel's kits instructs litigants to challenge the constitutionality of Canada's vaccination requirements for air travellers. This Court has struck eight substantially identical claims based on this kit.

C. *Mr. Turmel's Comments on Social Media*

[32] Mr. Turmel frequently uses social media to insult the intelligence or integrity of judges who dismiss his proceedings or those commenced by users of his litigation kits. He calls judges

“imbeciles”, and alleges that those who have dismissed his cannabis or COVID-19 kit claims have “blood on their hands” or “deserve death row for what they have done.”

[33] In January 2017, after this Court struck claims based on one of his litigation kits, Mr. Turmel alleged in a social media post that one of the plaintiffs had cancer and was medically authorized to use cannabis, but the “Judge said that's not enough. Wanted to see her X-rays, maybe give her a feel for those tumors before Doubting Thomas would believe.”

[34] In another instance, after the FCA stayed a proceeding based on Mr. Turmel’s litigation kit concerning the public possession and shipping limit of medical cannabis, Mr. Turmel observed: “I feel sad for what [the judge] has done to punish 7,000 sick people. Because that’s the number who will benefit when we strike the cap. God’ll get him.”

III. Issues

[35] This application raises the following issues:

A. Should Mr. Turmel be declared a vexatious litigant?

B. If so, what restrictions are appropriate?

IV. Analysis

A. *Should Mr. Turmel be declared a vexatious litigant?*

[36] Subsection 40(1) of the *Federal Courts Act* provides as follows:

Vexatious proceedings	**Poursuites vexatoires**
40 (1) If the Federal Court of Appeal or the Federal Court is satisfied, on application, that a person has persistently instituted vexatious proceedings or has conducted a proceeding in a vexatious manner, it may order that no further proceedings be instituted by the person in that court or that a proceeding previously instituted by the person in that court not be continued, except by leave of that court.	40 (1) La Cour d'appel fédérale ou la Cour fédérale, selon le cas, peut, si elle est convaincue par suite d'une requête qu'une personne a de façon persistante introduit des instances vexatoires devant elle ou y a agi de façon vexatoire au cours d'une instance, lui interdire d'engager d'autres instances devant elle ou de continuer devant elle une instance déjà engagée, sauf avec son autorisation.

[37] This provision empowers the Court to prevent one litigant from squandering judicial resources through duplicative proceedings and pointless litigation by declaring them to be vexatious (*Canada (Attorney General) v Ubah*, 2021 FC 1466 [*Ubah*] at para 24, citing *Simon v Canada (Attorney General)*, 2019 FCA 28 [*Simon*] at paras 15-16). As Justice David Stratas explained in *Simon*, courts are community property, not a private resource meant to advance the interests of one (at paras 9-10):

> Litigants have a right of access to this community property and the Court's resources: *Trial Lawyers Association of British Columbia v. British Columbia (Attorney General)*, 2014 SCC 59, [2014] 3 S.C.R. 31. For most litigants, the usual regulatory measures in the Rules suffice. For some, tougher regulatory measures are needed: *Fabrikant v. Canada*, 2018 FCA 171; *Fabrikant v. Canada*, 2018 FCA 206; *Fabrikant v. Canada*, 2018 FCA 224. Further, in the cases of a select few, the nature and quality of their behaviour, the actual or likely recurrence of that behaviour in multiple proceedings, and the harm they cause to other litigants and the Court make a vexatious litigant declaration necessary: *Olumide* at para. 24.

[38] While "vexatiousness" does not have a precise meaning, its indicia may include: (a) instituting frivolous proceedings; (b) making scandalous or unsupported allegations against opposing parties; (c) re-litigating settled issues; (d) unsuccessfully appealing decisions; (e) ignoring court orders and rules; and (f) refusing to pay outstanding cost awards (*Olumide v Canada*, 2016 FC 1106 at para 10). Mr. Turmel exhibits all of these indicia.

[39] The courts have dismissed virtually all of the proceedings brought by Mr. Turmel and his kit users. Common reasons for dismissal are that the claims failed to disclose reasonable causes of action, were scandalous, frivolous, vexatious or abuses of process, or were unsupported by evidence.

[40] Mr. Turmel and his kit users have frequently attempted to re-litigate matters. For example, in *Turmel v Canada*, 2022 FC 732, this Court struck Mr. Turmel's constitutional challenge to Canada's vaccination requirements for air travellers because the matter had been decided in a previous claim, and declared his second challenge to be an abuse of process. The

Court also expressed concern about the boilerplate nature of the statement of claim (at paras 9, 11-12).

[41] Mr. Turmel and his kit users have often brought identical motions for interlocutory relief, claiming that the impugned legislative provisions violate their Charter rights. These motions have all been dismissed, as have Mr. Turmel's numerous appeals.

[42] In his social media posts, Mr. Turmel admits that he has filed materials for others, that his litigation kits lack merit, and that his goal is to "flood the registry" with claims. He has frequently made disparaging remarks about opposing parties and the courts.

[43] Mr. Turmel has failed to comply with court orders. He has been charged with contempt for violating a publication ban issued by the Quebec Superior Court, and he has frequently shown disregard for court rules and timelines.

[44] Rule 119 of the Rules states that an individual may act in person or be represented by a solicitor in a proceeding. Mr. Turmel nevertheless purports to make legal submissions on behalf of others, despite not being a solicitor and in defiance of numerous admonitions from the courts not to engage in this behaviour.

[45] Not only are Mr. Turmel's litigation kits ineffective; they have also caused direct harm to the legal and financial interests of those who have used them. In a post on social media, Jeff Harris, one of Mr. Turmel's "lead plaintiffs", wrote the following:

> People put their faith in you to help and you never do. you spout lies and nonsense but when the Crown does it-you cry foul...way too funny. you think you're such a big deal and so important. just because you're a loser?? i guess we should be aware of something like you […]
>
> too bad you didn't cover all the costs. I had to pay some myself. you knew there was more to pay but you said nothing to me after your cheques ran out. nice try claiming you paid it all...another LIE!
>
> [*sic* throughout]

[46] Mr. Turmel has paid just one of the many costs orders issued against him, in the amount of $100. The remaining accumulated sum of $18,453.04 remains unpaid. An additional 22 cost orders totalling $16,362.82 awarded against his kit users remain unpaid. In social media posts, Mr. Turmel has told kit users that "It's okay to skip out on costs" and remarked, "I'd forgotten about all the times I stiffed them on costs."

[47] The test for vexatiousness is if "the litigant's ungovernability or harmfulness to the court system and its participants justify a leave-granting process for any new proceedings" (*Simon* at para 18). Mr. Turmel is a vexatious litigant. His conduct is both ungovernable and harmful, and requires the imposition of restrictions on his conduct before this Court.

B. *What restrictions are appropriate?*

[48] The AGC asks that Mr. Turmel be required to obtain leave before instituting new proceedings in this Court. In addition, the AGC proposes that this Court: (a) make leave conditional on payment of Mr. Turmel's outstanding costs; (b) prohibit Mr. Turmel from

preparing court materials or assisting others with their proceedings; and (c) order that no proceedings be instituted using materials prepared by Mr. Turmel, except with leave.

[49] This Court has plenary jurisdiction to impose additional requirements as may be necessary to prevent abuses of process (*Ubah* at para 44; *Canada (Attorney General) v Fabrikant*, 2019 FCA 198 [*Fabrikant*] at para 2). Vexatiousness comes in many shapes and sizes, and each vexatious litigant may require the Court to impose different measures (*Fabrikant* at para 45):

> In cases such as this, a vexatious litigant order should try to do the following:
>
> - Bar vexatious litigants from litigating themselves, litigating through proxies, and assisting others with their litigation.
> - Rule on the issue whether the vexatious litigant's pending cases should be discontinued; if so, describe the manner in which they may be resurrected and continued.
> - Prevent the Registry from spending time on unnecessary communications and worthless filings.
> - Permit access to the Court by leave, and only in the narrow circumstances permitted by law where access is necessary and the respondent has respected the procedural rules and previous court orders; in such cases, ensure that interested persons have the opportunity to make submissions.
> - Empower the Registry to take quick and administratively simple steps to protect itself, the Court and other litigants from vexatious behaviour.
> - Preserve the Court's powers to act further, when necessary, to adjust the vexatious litigant order, but only in accordance with procedural fairness.
> - Ensure that other judgments, orders and directions, to the extent not inconsistent with the vexatious litigant order, remain in effect and can be enforced.

[50] Some litigants may require "certain safeguards and restrictions" to discourage them from finding other ways to continue their vexatious conduct (*Badawy v 1038482 Alberta Ltd (IntelliView Technologies Inc)*, 2019 FC 504 at para 121). In *Ubah*, Justice Christine Pallotta prohibited a vexatious litigant from preparing documents intended to be filed in this Court for any person other than himself, and from filing or otherwise communicating with the Court except on his own behalf (at paras 50-51):

> Also, I agree with the AGC that it is essential to implement restrictions to prevent Mr. Ubah from litigating by proxy—a key reason why Mr. Ubah's conduct is harmful and ungovernable. Mr. Ubah is not a lawyer. He is not bound by rules of professional conduct or accountability. Yet his conduct in these matters resembles the conduct of a lawyer.
>
> Preventing litigation by proxy is one of the aims of a vexatious litigant order, as set out in *Fabrikant* at paragraph 45. The consequence of restrictions on Mr. Ubah's ability to litigate by proxy is that the proceedings where this appears to be the case should not continue except with leave of the Court. […]

[51] I am satisfied that similar restrictions are appropriate here. In addition, Mr. Turmel should be prohibited from seeking leave to commence new proceedings until all of his outstanding costs awards are paid in full. I note that a similar requirement was imposed by Chief Justice Marc Noël of the FCA in *Potvin v Rooke*, 2019 FCA 285 at paragraph 8.

[52] The AGC asks that these restrictions apply equally to the commencement of new proceedings in the FCA. This remedy was granted by Justice Roger Hughes in *Lawyers' Professional Indemnity Company v Coote*, 2013 FC 643 [*Coote FC*]. In a subsequent proceeding, *Coote v Canada (Human Rights Commission)*, 2021 FCA 150 [*Coote FCA*], Justice Stratas

observed that the Order of Justice Hughes "prohibited the appellant from directly or indirectly instituting or continuing any proceedings in the Federal Court of Canada and in this Court except with leave of a judge of the Federal Court" [emphasis original] (at para 3). The AGC therefore maintains that this Court has jurisdiction to impose restrictions on the institution of new proceedings in the FCA.

[53] In *Stukanov v Canada (Attorney General)*, 2022 FC 1421, Justice Glennys McVeigh declined to impose restrictions on a vexatious litigant's ability to institute new proceedings in the FCA: "Regarding the Federal Court of Appeal request, this Court cannot make such an order and the Respondent must seek that separately from the Federal Court of Appeal" (at para 2). The AGC notes that the decision does not contain any detailed discussion of the jurisdictional implications of this remedy, but the same may be said of *Coote FC* and *Coote FCA*.

[54] While *Coote FCA* may be taken as an implicit endorsement of this Court's capacity to impose restrictions on the commencement of proceedings in the FCA, I am left in some doubt whether this Court's jurisdiction extends to the regulation of matters before the FCA. I therefore decline to impose restrictions on Mr. Turmel's conduct before the FCA. In the event that the Judgment in this application is appealed, the FCA may wish to provide further guidance on this jurisdictional question.

[55] In all other respects, the relief requested by the AGC should be granted.

JUDGMENT

THIS COURT'S JUDGMENT is that:

1. John C. Turmel is declared to be a vexatious litigant pursuant to s 40 of the *Federal Courts Act*.

2. Mr. Turmel is prohibited from instituting new proceedings in this Court, or continuing any proceedings previously instituted by Mr. Turmel, except with leave of the Court.

3. Any application by Mr. Turmel for leave to institute or continue a proceeding must, in addition to satisfying the criteria in s 40(4) of the *Federal Courts Act*, demonstrate that all outstanding costs awards against Mr. Turmel in this Court have been paid in full.

4. Mr. Turmel is prohibited from preparing, distributing, or in any way disseminating court documents, including template documents, for use by others in proceedings before this Court.

5. Mr. Turmel is prohibited from assisting others with any proceedings before this Court, including by filing materials, or purporting to represent them, or communicating with the Court on their behalf.

6. No further proceedings may be instituted in this Court using originating documents, including template documents, which are in any way prepared, distributed or disseminated by Mr. Turmel, except with leave of the Court.

7. Costs of this application are awarded against Mr. Turmel in the all-inclusive sum of $500.00.

"Simon Fothergill"
Judge

FEDERAL COURT

SOLICITORS OF RECORD

DOCKET:	T-962-22
STYLE OF CAUSE:	ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA v JOHN C. TURMEL
PLACE OF HEARING:	TORONTO, ONTARIO
DATE OF HEARING:	OCTOBER 19, 2022
JUDGMENT AND REASONS:	FOTHERGILL J.
DATED:	NOVEMBER 9, 2022

APPEARANCES:

Jon Bricker	FOR THE APPLICANT
John C. Turmel (on his own behalf)	FOR THE RESPONDENT

SOLICITORS OF RECORD:

Attorney General of Canada Toronto, Ontario	FOR THE APPLICANT