File No. T-962-22

FEDERAL COURT

BETWEEN:

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA

Applicant

and

JOHN C. TURMEL

Respondent

RESPONDENT RECORD

Table of Contents

1. Respondent's Memorandum............................ 2

For the Respondent:
John C. Turmel, B. Eng.,
58 Brant Ave., Brantford, N3T 3H1,
Tel/Fax: 519-753-5122, Cell: 519-209-1848
Email: johnturmel@yahoo.com

For the Applicant:
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA
120 Adelaide Street West, Suite 400 Toronto ON M5H 1T1
Tel: 647-256-7473 Fax: (416) 973-0809
Per: Jon Bricker
E-mail: Jon.Bricker@justice.gc.ca

RESPONDENT'S MEMORANDUM

PART I - OVERVIEW

1. Applicant alleges the respondent, John C. Turmel, epitomizes the vexatious litigantabusing the resources of the Federal Courts for more than forty years with meritless, frivolous and vexatious proceedings and appeals. often bringing improper purposes with frequent attempts to re-litigate previously decided issues using pleadings to make scandalous allegations against other parties, and refusing to follow court order, rules, timelines and to pay costs orders.

2. Applicant's Record is available online at:
http://SmartestMan.Ca/s40r1.pdf Vol 1 (Notice)
http://SmartestMan.Ca/s40r2.pdf Vol 2
http://SmartestMan.Ca/s40r3.pdf Vol 3
http://SmartestMan.Ca/s40r4.pdf Vol 4
http://SmartestMan.Ca/s40r5.pdf Vol 5
http://SmartestMan.Ca/s40r6.pdf Vol 6
http://SmartestMan.Ca/s40r7.pdf Vol 7
http://SmartestMan.Ca/s40r8.pdf Vol 8 (Memorandum)
http://SmartestMan.Ca/s40rba.pdf Book of Authorities

3. Respondent submits the remedies sought were righteous, many life and death, despite many courts' failure to see the national, international or personal import. When the courts were wrong, I kept relitigating in search of a court that would be right. As a pauper, I almost never had the money to pay cost orders. And after examining me on my finances, the Crown stopped trying to collect.

4. Respondent did develop litigation "kits" consisting of template court materials, and recruited others to flood the courts with their righteous complaints. Having failed to see, this Court has dismissed nearly 700 of these claims to date stating they were meritless, frivolous or vexatious.

5. Applicant alleges in the course of these claims, Respondent has attempted to represent others even though he is not licensed to practice law, and has used social media to insult members of the Federal Courts and discourage others from paying costs. Respondent has never represented others without permission of the courts, has criticized the courts' failure to grant righteous remedies sought and has urged others to resist paying costs for having sought righteous remedies denied.

6. Applicant seeks an order:

> **a) that no further proceedings other than an appeal from any order in the present application may be instituted, and that any proceeding previously instituted may not be continued, by Mr. Turmel in the Federal Court or the Federal Court of Appeal, except with leave of the Federal Court;**
>
> **b) that any application by Mr. Turmel for leave to institute or continue proceedings 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 the Federal Courts have been paid in full;**

c) prohibiting Mr. Turmel from preparing, distributing or in any way disseminating court documents, including template documents, for use by others in proceedings before the Federal Courts;

d) prohibiting Mr. Turmel from assisting others with their proceedings in the Federal Courts, including by filing materials or by purporting to represent or communicate with the courts on their behalf;

e) that no further proceedings may be instituted in the Federal Courts using originating documents, including template documents, that are in any way prepared, distributed or disseminated by Mr. Turmel, except with leave of the Federal Court;

f) for costs.

SUBMISSIONS

7. Since 1980, I have instituted at least 67 court proceedings. This includes 20 claims and applications in this Court, 13 appeals to the Federal Court of Appeal, 18 applications and appeals in the Ontario courts, and 27 applications for leave to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada.

A. Proceedings concerning banking issues

8. In 1981, I filed an unsuccessful application in this court for an order that "the Bank of Canada cease and desist

the genocidal practice of interest" arguing that interest on loans inflicted on borrowers conditions of life calculated to bring about their physical destruction by foreclosure on farmers in a world with starving people. Appeal and application for leave to appeal dismissed.

9. In 1982, the County Court of Ontario granted an action by Toronto Dominion Bank against Mr. Turmel, and awarded judgment in the amount of $2,813.19. After unsuccessfully appealing to the Court of Appeal for Ontario. I sought leave to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada where, according to the reported leave decision, I argued that the interest rates charged by the bank were a violation of natural, biblical or criminal laws:

a) Natural Law: you can't pay 11 when they only printed 10 without getting some off your fellow borrower, the death-gamble was a competition to the death.

b) Biblical Law: "If you have money, do not lend it out at interest," Jesus Thomas 95, "Let the exacting of interest stop" Nehemiah 5:10 and many more...

c) Criminal Law: Gaming house law makes it illegal to charge a fee to participate in a gamble and interest is a fee to participate in a death-gamble.

10. The righteous remedy sought would grant all citizens an interest-free credit card. Restricting bank computers to a pure service charge and abolishing the interest charge would have ended the annual deaths of 40 million victims due to poverty. The Supreme Court of Canada dismissed this leave application. That's over a billion and a half souls who

would have been saved had the courts granted the remedy sought 40 years ago.

11. Respondent published "Stiff-the-bank" kits for others to resist their evictions in the courts with several prominent cases: Jean Metcalfe, allergic lady in Smiths Falls being evicted from her allergy-proofed home, Bela Devecseri, being evicted in Ottawa after having his restaurant seized to make way for a highway and being short-changed, the Woodhouse family being evicted in Toronto but remaining in the home for 33 months during the fight... and maybe 50 others including 8 to the Supreme Court.

12. In those days, a debtor's foreclosure was automatically stayed pending appeals and applicants for leave to appeal to the Supreme Court with a 15-minute live presentation . With many appellants on the way, the Ontario Court of Appeal removed automatic stays pending appeal and made Appellants seek leave; the Supreme court removed any right to a personal hearing allowing leave applications to be dismissed with such hearing.

B. Proceedings concerning election issues

(a) Equitable free broadcast time

13. Being a regular candidate in federal, provincial and municipal elections, Respondent has brought twelve proceedings against the Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission (" CRTC") and several broadcasters concerning the broadcasters' inequitable allocation of free political broadcast time or exclusion from various debate broadcasts.

14. Section 9 of the Broadcasting Act said that free-time had to be shared among rival parties and candidates "on an equitable basis, quantitatively and qualitatively."

15. In 1980 10 Ottawa-Center candidates were divided into two groups with the 5 major candidates receiving 20 minutes and 5 minor candidates receiving 15 minutes for an average of 1 minute less. Judicious placing of the commercial in the middle would have made the broadcast equitable. The case of the Missing Minute was appealed to the Supreme Court with such allocation remaining deemed equitable.

16. So at every inequitable sharing of free broadcast time, I complained to the CRTC and then relitigated seeking relief against that federal board in Federal Court. But every judge ruled that my getting less or no free-time looked quantitatively and qualitatively equitable to them and despite constant relitigation, no judge ever found that zero time was not a quantitatively and qualitatively equitable share.

(b) Cap on election auditor fee insufficient

17. The cap on election audit fees paid by Elections Canada was $250 back in 1979. My accountant took the $250 fee to audit my zero-expense elections but after 30 years, he retired. I had to switch auditors and the new one charged me over $700. So I asked the court to strike the $250 cap that had not changed in 30 years because having to pay the remaining $500 would impede my right to participate in elections. Judge Phelan ruled I could save it up out of my pension and dismissed my claim.

18. I made a presentation to the Parliamentary Committee on Election Reform saying I shouldn't need an auditor to check my election return for a bus ticket and Parliament changed the Election Act to make auditor reports unnecessary for campaigns that spent under $10,000! Though the court failed to rule that the $250 cap was insufficient for poor candidates, Parliament got rid of the need for an auditor report for poor candidates! So Parliament fixed the violation of right that the court did not.

C. Proceedings concerning gaming issues

(a) Possession of a deck of cards as gambling device:

19. Because I had allowed anyone to be the bank at blackjack, I could not be charged with keeping a common gaming house. In 1981, I was charged with possession of the gambling device, the deck of cards. I brought an application in this court for an order compelling the provincial Crown to prosecute retailer Simpsons-Sears for selling decks of playing cards with the purpose "to drag someone really big down with me" who could better defend the charge, which I hoped would lead to the gaming-devices offence being repealed, amended or no longer enforced. My being charged with possession of a gambling device because it's still on the books was okay but me charging Simpsons Sears with the same offence was improper. So I am the last and perhaps only person ever convicted of possession of a deck of cards in Canada.

(b) Common gaming house gain to include "winnings":

20. I have been charged with keeping a common gaming house multiple times. http://SmartestMan.ca/gambler details the OPP's Project Robin Hood raid on Casino Turmel, the largest gaming house raid on an underground 28-table poker and blackjack casino in history. In that proceeding, I brought three unsuccessful interlocutory applications to quash the criminal charges.

21. Though my motion to quash was dismissed, because I had stood mute at plea pursuant to CCC S.606 and made the court enter my not-guilty plea for me, the Manitoba Bingo Enterprises case had ruled that where the Defendant stands mute, he has not pleaded. So when new information arose making my point, I moved to quash again, and then again. That's why I have always advised all those I helped in criminal cases to not plead but remain mute in case they needed that advantage.

22. In order to convict me after I'd been formerly acquitted, despite the "Despite the "Strict Interpretation of Criminal Statutes" which states a court may tighten the interpretation to acquit an accused but may not expand it to convict, the court expanded the meaning of the word "gain" to convict "winnings" that had never been formerly declared illegal. Since Parliament had not expended the prohibition, the new definition is now in the Criminal Code:

> **"Gain" - as used in S.197 para.(a), "gain" can include direct winnings. Consequently, where the accused was an exceptionally skilled professional gambler who supported**

the commercial gambling establishment and paid employees out of his large winnings, the premises fall within the meaning of "common gaming house" R. v. Turmel (1996) 109 C.C.C. (3d) 162 (Ont.C.A.)

23. So the violation of the "Strict Interpretation of Criminal Statutes" by expanding the meaning of the word "gain" to include "winnings" not by Parliament but by a judge is recorded right in the Criminal Code! My appeal of conviction and application for leave to appeal to Supreme Court of Canada were dismissed.

D. Proceedings against the CBC Dragons den defamation

24. In 2010, two separate libel actions against CBC's Dragons Den in the Ontario Superior Court of Justice related to my appearance on the Dragon's Den television program, were both dismissed.

25. Dragons Den cut my 15 minute presentation down to 1 minute to ridicule me by publishing only those parts where they were laughing at me and not those parts where I was laughing at them so I sued for defamation and they were forced to give me the whole show which I published online: KingofthePaupers on Dragons Den for Brantford Bucks 10% Royalty http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UV0L2hyqAZc

26. Appeal and Application for Leave to Appeal to Supreme Court were dismissed.

E. Proceedings concerning cannabis issues

(a) Contempt of court conviction

27. I once violated the publication ban arguing it was necessary to end a genocide of medical cannabis users going on after Health Canada cannabis director Cindy Cripps-Prawak's had testified in my brother's case that they had 94 files which had not been accepted or refused but had been classified as "dormant" which I deduced were the number of people who could no longer finish their correspondence. Probably by reason of death. 94 people waiting for their doctor's prescriptions to be exempted by the Minister croaked while being successfully stalled. Over the year in question, that's 8 a month.

28. It made sense. Consider the case of Don Appleby suffering AIDS whose exemption took over 1 year before being refused. How many other AIDS patients waiting a year became dormant before their exemptions could be added to the refused category? "Dormant" six feet under?" Once they died and could no longer correspond with the Ministry, where did they put those files? There had to be some. There is no category "died before process." So the only conclusion I could come to was that 8 people a month were dying without their prescribed medicine.

29. So despite the impropriety, like the man who raises his voice in a cinema to shout "fire" is justified in violating that publication ban, so too, my raising my voice to shout "94 deaths with 8 more a month" seemed justified in violating that publication ban. Or so I argued. Though I

faced a fine and 90 days in jail, the chance to raise the alarm about the genocide going on made it worth a try. I was convicted and fined $250.

30. Despite Applicant alleging: He often refuses to follow court orders, rules and timelines" this is the only court "order" I have ever ignored and was punished for. And Applicant cites no court ever permitting me to refuse to follow the rules or timelines, a silly allegation.

(b) Possession prohibition invalid

31. On July 31 2000, the Parker decision declared the marijuana possession prohibition invalid absent a workable medical exemption. The MMAR was promulgated Aug 1 2001 without Parker having received an exemption, only the application form. In 2002 and 2003, I brought two unsuccessful civil applications in the Ontario Superior Court of Justice for orders declaring the marihuana provisions of the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act were invalid absent a workable exemption for Parker. The Court of Appeal for Ontario dismissed both appeals, and the Supreme Court of Canada dismissed an application Turmel for leave to appeal.

(c) Parliament Hill bust

32. I was personally charged in 2003 with possession of marihuana for the purposes of trafficking. This was on the day that the new "decriminalization" legislation was being introduced. I knew the law had been dead since they failed to come up with a working exemption for Parker in the MMAR

within a year and that this was really "recriminalization." I'd have to start trying to strike the prohibition all over. So I faxed that I was going to Parliament Hill with 7 pounds of marijuana hoping to deter the legislation by showing that the law was dead by passing it out with a pound for the Prime Minister, one for the Justice Minister, one for the Supreme Court, one for Superior Court, one for the RCMP, one for the OPP and wasn't charged, I could go home and smoke the 7th myself. I got charged. But the Ottawa Citizen headline was: Ottawa holds back marijuana bill! A few weeks later, Parliament was prorogued and we never got a new recriminalization until Trudeau in 2018.

33. In 2003, the Alberta Court of Appeal ruled in R. v. Krieger that the production prohibition was invalid absent a workable exemption.

(d) 4,000 charges stayed

34. My appeal did result in the Crown staying 4,000 charges: http://SmartestMan.Ca/stay4k.jpg but that court in Hitzig ruled that its fixing the exemption resurrected the prohibition.

35. The Interpretation Act said only Parliament can revive a prohibition once declared invalid. Hence the POLCOA acronym: Parliament Only Legislates, Courts Only Abrogate.

36. Since then, all my quash motions on cannabis charges then asked the judges if they were going to obey the Interpretation act that says it had to be revived by Parliament or the Hitzig Court that said they had revived it without Parliament. No judge ever obeyed the Interpretation Act.

(e) Criminal Code Wins

37. I frequently provided legal assistance to others charged with marihuana offences. Between 2008 and 2014, http://SmartestMan.Ca/wins shows over 80 self-defenders armed with my quash and constitutional templates who got great results using my defence kits where Crowns either withdrew the charges or offered sweet deals with discharges that involved no criminal record.

38. Applicant alleges courts in criminal proceedings have described his kit applications as obvious tactics to delay and frustrate proceedings. The Quash and Constitutional Motions are never to delay but to win withdrawals or sweet deals.

39. As for my trying to file impermissible materials, such as summary-judgment motions in a simplified action, I was improperly advised by the Registry to file my action as "simplified" and when I found out I could not file the motion, I asked the court to change it and it was.

40. As for my failure to pursue his appeals at all on at least three occasions, That is a very low probability given the large number of appeals filed. Not quite "regular."

41. As for missing a few deadlines, the courts have granted extensions in many of these cases, they have denied extensions in others. Not a big deal.

(d) Manson J. MMAR extension

42. Health Canada announced in October 2013 that the MMAR grow exemptions were being terminated on April 1 2014 to be replaced by the MMPR that would let them purchase their cannabis from Licensed Producers. But as April 1 neared, there were insufficient L.P.s to furnish the cannabis for 36,000 permit-holders. Since the Parker decision stated the prohibition becomes invalid absent a working exemption and everyone's MMAR permits were being cancelled on April 1 2014 when the MMPR took over and they would then not be able to buy their pot from not enough Licensed Producers, so the prohibitions were going to be invalidated on April 1 2014 when the MMPR exemption failed.

43. So rather than everyone becoming legal on April 1, John Conroy suckered MMAR permit holders into believing they would no longer be exempt after April 1 and requesting an extension of the MMAR so they would remain legal (while everyone else remained illegal).

43. Judge Manson granted the extension of the MMAR exemption... to only half the patients whose permits had not expired. Everyone's grow permits were extended but only the possess permits of those whose exemptions had not expired were.

44. Robert Roy's permit expired on Mar 18 2014, the date of the hearing. But Judge Manson reserved his decision until Mar 21. So because Roy had not paid a doctor to renew his exemption in the 2 weeks from Mar 18 to April 1, his possession permit for what he had a permit to grow was

cancelled. About 18,000 of Canada's 36,000 exempted patients lost their prescriptions that day. So while the half whose permits were extended made news celebrating, the other half who'd had their prescriptions cancelled were not heard. Imagine how many suffered and died of the stress of losing their prescribed and cheap medication! Until their court actions with my templates made the news.

45.Since then, I developed litigation "kits" consisting of template court materials challenging the constitutionality of various aspects of Canada's medical cannabis regulatory regime, and distributed these via his websites for others to download, complete and file in the Federal Courts. Individuals have filed or attempted to file hundreds of substantially identical proceedings based on these kits, including:

> **(a) 315 actions, including one by Mr. Turmel, challenging the former Marihuana Medical Access Regulations and Marihuana for Medical Purposes Regulations (the "Turmel Kit MMAR-MMPR claims");**

46. Judge Phelan dismissed their claims on the grounds the statements of claim contained vague generalizations and hyperbole, but virtually no detail concerning each plaintiff's personal circumstances or how the impugned regulatory provisions engaged their individual Charter rights. It wasn't enough that their doctor had prescribed it, Judge Phelan wanted to see their medical files too. Many appealed his wanting to look into what he wasn't qualified to see. The Federal Court of Appeal agreed he should have been shown their medical files. We might have known it if only he'd come to the hearing wearing his stethoscope.

(e) Juice and Oil

> **(c) Nine actions, including one by Mr. Turmel for declarations that the CDSA infringed s. 7 of the Charter by failing to provide access to cannabis juice and oil for medical purposes (the "Turmel Kit juice and oil claims");**

47. Licensed Producers did not offer juice or oil and only self-growing could do that.

(f) Delay in processing

> **(d) 393 actions challenging the processing time for Health Canada registration to produce cannabis for personal medical use (the ""Turmel Kit processing-time claims");**

48. Health Canada used to process MMAR permits in under a month and now they were processing them in 5 to 11 months. So, my template started with a Statement of Claim for damages due to delay, lost rent and pot not grown, with over 80 motions for interim permits while waiting for Health Canada to deliver their permits. In almost all motions, Health Canada hopped to it and delivered the permit so the Crown could tell the judge that the motion hearing was now mooted and no longer necessary since the permit had been delivered.

49. I have continued to distribute and promote the Turmel Kit processing-time claims long after the Federal Court of Appeal and this court struck hundreds of these claims. In

2021, Igor Mozajko had to file an action against the delay in processing his change of address and they hopped to it to mooten his hearing. In 2021, Gisele Pilon had to file an action against the delay in processing her permit and they hopped to it to mooten her claim. So Health Canada is still making people wait for their permits and the kits are still useful to those victims.

50. My templates allowing self-represented plaintiffs to seek remedy for the torts being suffered not by hitting the streets but by filing in the courts is not an improper purpose.

51. As for serving and filing materials for others, including a deceased person, Sharon Misener had her permit cancelled by Judge Manson and filed motions to the top to get it back. But she died while waiting for her Reconsideration of the Supreme Court decision. The Registry found out she had died trying to get her medicine back and cancelled her motion for reconsideration of losing her permit.

(g) - Permits not expire upon delayed renewal processing

52. Some whose permits would expire while they waited for renewal and they would have to take down their grows and destroy their saved up medication filed motions for interim court permits pending delivery of their Health Canada permits. For most, Health Health Canada had to hop to it and grant the permits to mooten their hearings.

(h) Permits start upon issuance, not doctor signing

53. Once permits were granted, they did not start upon issuance of the permit but upon the date many months earlier when the doctor signed. If it took 6 months of your 1-year prescription to process, you lost 6 months and had to pay your doctor again in only 6 months. When Judge Brown demanded an explanation for the back-dating paid off when they changed the rules so the Oct 12 2018 page from the Health Canada site read:

> **Improvements for these patients include that:**
>
> **the effective date on the registration document will be the day it is issued, rather than the day the medical document was signed by the health care provider**
>
> **registration will remain valid until a renewal decision has been made, if Health Canada has received a renewal application before your certificate expires**

So there were no more motions from desperate and stressed-out patients awaiting their renewals with their expiry date looming. I have no doubt Judge Brown's comments were instrumental in obtaining that relief.

(i) 150 gram challenges

> **(e) 36 actions challenging the 150-gram public limit on public possession and shipping of cannabis for medical purposes (the "Turmel Kit public possession and shipping limit claims");**

54. The MMPR that was eventually struck had introduced a cap of 150 grams on possession. When judge Manson extended the MMAR, he imposed the new MMPR 150 gram cap on possession! So Parliament did not impose the new cap, Judge Manson did. In BC, some high-dosers applied to strike the cap and the judge granted them a 10-day supply possession limit.

55. So my claim template asked to strike the cap and for the interim remedy of the same 10-day supply pending the hearing of the action. Judge Brown dismissed the Crown motion to strike the action against the cap and granted the Lead Plaintiff the same 10-day supply granted in the B.C. Garber case. http://johnturmel.com/150cn1j.pdf but the Federal Court of Appeal overruled him, sustained by the Supreme Court of Canada. http://johnturmel.com/150fcaj.pdf

(j) Annual renewals

> **(f) Four actions challenging the requirement for annual healthcare practitioner authorization to use cannabis for medical purposes;21**

56. The claim argued that it was a needless hassle for patients with permanent diseases to see a doctor to renew every year.

(k) Application rejection

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

57. Plaintiff Arthur Jackes, whose application was rejected because it was signed in blue ink, objected that Licensed Producers were urged to sign their application in black ink.

(l Grower caps

> **(h) One action challenging the production-site requirements for individuals producing cannabis for personal medical use,**

58. This was the challenge no more than 2 patients for a Designated Grower and no more than 4 licenses per site as being enacted to make it uneconomic for small dosers to find a grower. When the Sfetkopoulos decision of this court struck the cap of 1 patient per grower as too unconstitutionally limiting, Health Canada promulgated a new cap of 2. When the Beren decision struck the cap of 3 licenses per site as too unconstitutionally limiting, Health Canada promulgated a new cap of 4. Jackes argued a minimal increase of 1 was still too unconstitutionally limiting and showed contempt for the courts.

(m) Criminal Record

> **(h) and one action challenging the criminal-record requirements.**

59. Bela Beke challenged the prohibition on a Designated Producer having a criminal record for cannabis in the past 10 years on the grounds they should have a right to go straight now that it was legal.

(n) Prevention

60. I did seek judicial recognition of a constitutional right for healthy individuals to use cannabis for preventive medical purposes. It made sense that what's good to cure the illness should be good to prevent the illness. And only one court ruled that there was no proof that it could prevent what it could cure.

F. Proceedings concerning federal COVID-19 mitigation measures

(a) Action against "any" restriction

61. Since January 2021, 80 self-represented plaintiffs joined me in filing substantially identical Federal Court claims against any restriction based on a the Covid Mortality Hyped Hundredfold false alarm due to WHO's comparing the Covid 3.4% "Apple" CFR "Case Fatality Rate" not to Flu's known 10% CFR "Apple" but to the 100-times smaller Flu 0.1% "Orange" IFR "Infection Fatality Rate" exaggerated the threat by a hundredfold; and CDC said masked social distanced lockdowns were needed when "most coronavirus cases spread from people with no symptoms." An asymptomatic spreader would unknowingly infect clusters of family and friends. But no such clusters have been found. On April 2 WHO found "no documented asymptomatic transmission." On June 3, Wuhan tested 10 million to find zero transmission by asymptomatics.

62. On July 21, 2021, after splitting me off from the other plaintiffs, Prothonotary Aylen (as she then was) ruled that WHO comparing Covid CFR to Flu IFR to hundredfold hype the threat was not a fact and struck my claim without leave to amend on the technicality that I had to specify which restriction affecting me was unconstitutional rather than get a declaration that any restriction was. I could not rely on the sufferings of the other plaintiffs who had been separated from me. The other 79 claims remain stayed pending the outcome of this appeal.

63. This Court has since dismissed my appeal of this decision. A further appeal to the Federal Court of Appeal is outstanding. I've appealed that she should have let the action go through since a judge can do anything that is just and it would be just to warn the world that the Covid mortality hyped a hundredfold was a false alarm. and Applicant seems to be hoping that this Court will bar the higher court from hearing that appeal.

64. Christine Anderson (German MP) EU called Covid Vaccines the Biggest Crime Ever Committed on Humanity. And finding out the Covid Mortality was a false alarm could have prevented it.

65. Dr. Francis Christian, former Director of Patient Safety and Quality of surgery in Saskatchewan (fired for warning us) https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kKbOvsLTbeU said 1 in 5,000 suffer myocarditis heart damage and noted that that's just those that are reported. It could be one in 1000. So of the 3 billion vaxed on the planet, there could be 3 million with new myocarditis we should expect to die in the next 5 to 10 years.

66. All because Judge Aylen found a technicality to not warn the world it was a false alarm. She didn't take smartestman.ca seriously and now has to live with the blood of millions on her hands. Whenever I see an article about someone collapsing and dying, I share it to my http://gab.com/johnturmel page with the comment asking if they would have taken the clot shot had Judge Aylen not suppressed that the Covid threat was a false alarm.

67. More articles are now coming out showing statistics that the vax mandate is a genocide, a genocide that only a declaration that the threat was a false alarm could have averted. So every Federal Court judge who read my action to find out it was a false and did nothing has the blood of millions on their hands.

(b) Action against "air travel" restriction

68. On February 16, 2022, after the air travel restriction had been placed on me, I filed a further claim challenging the constitutionality of Canada's vaccination requirements for air travellers based on a false alarm. On May 18, 2022, Prothonatary Horne struck this claim without leave to amend on grounds the Mobility right in the Charter ensures the right to live in, move to, or work in any province but not to travel domestically. Premier Brian Peckford and People's Party Leader Maxime Bernier have also filed actions relying on the Charter right to Mobility and will find out, as we did, it does not apply, So I did not appeal. And Judge Horne hit me with $2,000 in costs and hit the other 8 plaintiffs with double the costs requested by the Crown. That's our punishment for trying to warn

the world of the Covid false alarm and save millions from the VAIDS genocide.

69. So I have brought no proceedings that are meritless, I submit the mega-deaths resulting from the court's failure to see the merit in my actions speaks for itself.

70. I have not brought any proceedings are were scandalous, frivolous, vexatious or an abuse of process though pointing out the mega-deaths does seem like hyperbole.

71. My actions were not supported by little or no evidence even if the judges failed to see the logic.

72. My appeals never failed to allege court error. To disagree with a righteous request is to err with lives at stake.

73. Applicant's allegation that I acknowledged that my kit proceedings lack merit is false. I would never say my actions lack merit. I did explain how an old template had listed the MMAR torts side by side with the MMPR torts and once the MMAR had been terminated, I still kept those torts to show where they came from to end up in the new MMPR. My actions always seek righteous remedy even when the courts fail to wee.

74. Applicant alleges Mr. Turmel makes unsubstantiated and intemperate remarks against other parties and the courts but has not cited even one unsubstantiated remark. Describing Bank of Canada interest policies and various aspects of Canada's medical cannabis regulatory regime as "genocidal is quite accurate if you count up the dead.

75. As for my statement that the public possession and shipping limits for medical cannabis and federal COVID-19 measures are the result of "statistical fraud," Judge Manson noted the average daily prescription was for 17.7 grams but Health Canada has claimed it was 1 to 3 grams. 17.7 described as 1-3 could only be by statistical fraud and I happen to be accredited expert in math by Federal Tax Court of Canada. The judges who failed to see are not.

76. As for suggesting COVID-19 itself is an "imaginary plague," deaths from which are greatly exaggerated by an "evil cabal" that includes the WHO, with the support of global media, has now become evident to all who now accept that the lockdowns killed more than the hundredfold-hyped virus did.

77. The cabal tricked the world into lockdown over a false alarm with forced vax to escape it. Can't get more evil than that. And the mortality statistics are now being revealed.

78. Applicant alleges I referred to judges as "imbeciles." I had asked whom posterity will rule to be the imbecile in the matter, (me or the judge?) I had said one of us was, not that the judge was.

79. I have claimed that the judges who dismissed my cannabis or COVID-19 claims have "blood on their hands" or "deserve death row for what they have done." Counting up the dead leaves little doubt. Who out of the 3 billion would have taken the experimental gene therapy if Judge Aylen hadn't suppressed that the Covid Mortality was a Hundredfold Hyped false alarm? Most. So all the adverse effects are on her tab.

80. As for my having undertaken to personally pay any costs award on behalf of all 26 appellants, I had undertaken to be responsible for all the costs because I could not pay them.

81. As for my advising some to pay $1, Applicant omitted ""while trying to pay the rest."

82. As for measures requested, I can live with applying for leave since my actions are always quite righteous. I only object to not being able to assist others. The benefits of my assistance has been demonstrated herein.

83. I would point out how little specificity was presented about my offences.

ORDER SOUGHT

84. Respondent seeks the dismissal of the Application

Dated at Brantford on Wednesday Aug 31 2022

John C. Turmel

File No. T-962-22

FEDERAL COURT

BETWEEN:

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA
Applicant

and

JOHN C. TURMEL
Respondent

RESPONDENT RECORD

For the Respondent:
John C. Turmel, B. Eng.,
58 Brant Ave.,
Brantford, N3T 3H1,
Tel/Fax: 519-753-5122,
Cell: 519-209-1848
Email: johnturmel@yahoo.com