Court of Queen's Bench of Alberta

Citation: Anderson v Ossowski, 2021 ABQB 428

Date: 20210601
Docket: 2101 03903
Registry: Calgary

Between:

Sandra Anderson

Plaintiff

- and -

John Ossowski, Paul MacKinnon, Joseph Lammerhirt, Lyle O'Bertos, Tyler Lord, Matthew Cobham, Laura De Kok, Randall Brittner, Melanie Brunet, Barb Zeisel, and Krissy Plume

Defendants

Memorandum of Decision
of the
Associate Chief Justice
J.D. Rooke

I. Introduction

[1] Pseudolaw, or Organized Pseudolegal Commercial Arguments [OPCA], are a collection of legally incorrect and abusive strategies marketed by conmen, "OPCA gurus", to gullible, ill-informed, and often criminal anti-government activists: ***Meads v Meads***, 2012 ABQB 571 [***Meads***]. Pseudolaw is marketed as the allegedly true superior law that has been concealed from the public. OPCA schemes are typically applied to evade income tax, as a "get out of jail free

card", to attack government and institutional actors, or as a way to purportedly nullify debts and get free money: ***Unrau v National Dental Examining Board***, 2019 ABQB 283 at para 178 [***Unrau #2***]. Employing pseudolaw is always an abuse of court processes, and warrants immediate court response: ***Unrau #2*** at paras 180, 670-671.

[2] This Court regularly encounters OPCA litigants, and, when it does, the Court attempts to better inform, educate, and clarify the true nature of Canadian law: ***Meads*** at para 6. Sometimes that approach leads to positive outcomes, where a litigant recognizes their errors, and adopts actual legal processes and principles to address their issues: e.g. ***DKD (Re)***, 2019 ABQB 26.[1] These are some "win-win" situations.

[3] Sandra Anderson [Ms. Anderson] is <u>not</u> one of these success stories. Ms. Anderson has been informed that her attempts to employ pseudolaw were erroneous, but she has not changed her ways. Ms. Anderson was pointed to legitimate legal authorities, and information on the actual law and operation of courts in Canada. She was shown that the gurus who teach the techniques she uses have themselves failed miserably in court. Ms. Anderson has ignored all that. Ms. Anderson, instead, has "doubled down", and extended her illegal actions even further. Ms. Anderson persists in her demands to attempt to commandeer government-operated courthouses, where she threatens that she will use those facilities to conduct her own pseudolaw do-it-yourself trial proceedings in what she calls the "Anderson Court". This claim is not simply wrong, but also absurd, and, beyond that, illegal.

[4] Before going further, I note that Ms. Anderson rejects that name. She writes:

> i, living soul, Sandra-Ann object to the use of Ms. Anderson; no where in my the Statement of Claim and Notice:Liability was there ever listed a Ms. Anderson. The use of this name is constructive fraudulent conversion theft under your section 322(1-3) of the Criminal Code (R.S.C., 1985, c. C-46 [Sic.]

[5] In ***Meads***, I concluded, at para 7, that the Court should pay no attention to, nor respect, demands concerning false and irrelevant OPCA name structures:

> ... While OPCA litigants and their gurus put special significance on these alternative nomenclature forms, these are ineffectual in law and are meaningless paper masks. Therefore, in these Reasons, I will omit spurious name forms, titles, punctuation and the like.

I take the same approach here. Ms. Anderson is Ms. Anderson, and if she dislikes that the Court will not adopt her spurious nomenclature, and the illusory rights she apparently thinks comes with that, then that is her problem.

[6] The background to this matter is that, on March 23, 2021, Ms. Anderson filed an unconventional bundle of documents with the Alberta Court of Queen's Bench that named eleven Defendants. On May 3, 2021, Counsel for the Attorney General of Canada, by letter, referred to the Court the March 23, 2021 materials as a candidate Apparently Vexatious

---

[1] When challenged by the Court, BGD (the respondent father of the dependent adult in the subject case) recognized that Ms. Anderson's guru, Carl (Karl) Lentz, was "a nut cake": ***DKD (Re)***, 2019 ABQB 26 at para 10. Similarly, Mr. Meads, of ***Meads***, himself, subsequently abandoned OPCA strategies, but that is not always the case. Sadly, Ms. Anderson is less discriminating when it comes to sources of legal advice.

Application or Proceeding [AVAP], pursuant to Civil Practice Note No. 7 [CPN7] paragraph 6. I am designated to receive and review potential CPN7 processes in Southern Alberta.

[7] In a decision reported as ***Anderson v Ossowski***, 2021 ABQB 382 [***Anderson #1***], I concluded that Ms. Anderson's filings were an AVAP that ought to be subject to a document-based show-cause procedure. ***Anderson #1*** at paras 2-6 reviews Ms. Anderson's March 23, 2021 filings. Three of those documents are reproduced in ***Anderson #1*** as Appendices "A-C".

[8] Ms. Anderson is a horse smuggler. In 2019, on two separate occasions, the Canada Border Service Agency [CBSA] seized horses that Ms. Anderson attempted to smuggle into Canada, one named Gaesbekers Gabbertje, the other whose name is undocumented. Ms. Anderson included photos of these two horses in her March 23, 2021 filings. When the horse smuggling was detected, Ms. Anderson had to pay $56,201.60 in fines for the release of the two horses. Ms. Anderson is also currently facing *Customs Act*, RSC 1985, c 1 (2nd Supp) and *Criminal Code*, RSC 1985, c C-46 charges in relation to her horse smuggling.

[9] Ms. Anderson has apparently concluded that the horse seizures, fines, and court charges are illegal - a "Trespass" upon her "common law" rights and her "property". So, on March 23, 2021, Ms. Anderson filed documents with the Alberta Court of Queen's Bench that purport to set up the "Anderson Court", a "common law court". Ms. Anderson, "prosecutor", would then purport to conduct an "Anderson Court" jury trial of the eleven Defendants, who are CBSA staff and employees and a Public Prosecution Service of Canada Crown Prosecutor, demanding refund of her horse smuggling fines, $500,000 in punitive damages, and recognition that Ms. Anderson is not subject to Canadian statute law. Ms. Anderson's March 23, 2021 filings demand that she will commandeer the facilities of the Alberta Court of Queen's Bench to conduct the "Anderson Court" proceedings. Ms. Anderson threatened court staff and judges who might interfere with that, a further "Trespass".

[10] I observed in ***Anderson #1*** at paras 19-28 that Ms. Anderson is employing well-known OPCA theories taught by US Sovereign Citizen OPCA guru Carl (Karl) Rudolph Lentz, and his Canadian acolyte, Christopher James Pritchard, a.k.a. "Christopher James". I directed Ms. Anderson to many court judgments from the US and Canada that have rejected Lentzian concepts, including his bizarre "do-it-yourself" courts scheme. Ms. Anderson was asked to respond with an up to ten-page Written Submission that answered why her filings are not abusive OPCA litigation, and, more specifically:

> 1. How are Canadian and US court decisions that have rejected Lentzian "do-it-yourself" court procedures wrong?
> 2. How is the "Anderson Court" not an unauthorized vigilante process purporting to have legal effect?
> 3. How is the "Anderson Court" not a OPCA vigilante court process, and, therefore, why is Ms. Anderson not in *prima facie* contempt of court?
>
> [***Anderson #1*** at para 33.]

[11] On May 27, 2021, Ms. Anderson emailed the Court a 20-page document that is not a Written Submission that responds to the three questions set out in ***Anderson #1*** at para 33. I, therefore, find that Ms. Anderson has not rebutted the *prima facie* abusive litigation characteristics identified in ***Anderson #1***, specifically:

1. her activities are based on well-known and refuted OPCA theories,
2. Ms. Anderson is conducting an unauthorized vigilante process purporting to have binding legal effect, and
3. Ms. Anderson is in *prima facie* contempt of court by attempting to operate the "Anderson Court" in Alberta Court of Queen's Bench facilities.

[12] That, alone, is a basis for me to immediately strike out Ms. Anderson's March 23, 2021 materials pursuant to *Alberta Rules of Court*, Alta Reg 124/2010, *Rule* 3.68, and CPN7. There is therefore no need for the Defendants to submit a Written Reply: CPN7 para 3(c).

[13] However, in her May 27, 2021 document, Ms. Anderson goes further, and now threatens further vigilante processes against myself, opposing Counsel, and pretty much everyone else, including Alberta Court of Queen's Bench staff, who might interfere with Ms. Anderson's plan to unilaterally usurp government court facilities and prosecute the Defendants, and others, in her so-called "Anderson Court".

II. The May 27, 2021 Document

[14] The May 27, 2021 document has four parts:

1. A five-page "NOTICE: Trespass, Liability and Fee Schedule" addressed to myself, Chief Justice Fraser of the Alberta Court of Appeal, the Alberta Minister of Justice and Solicitor General, the Lieutenant Governor of Alberta, Chief Justice Wagner of the Supreme Court of Canada, and the Deputy Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada. The body of this document is reproduced as Appendix "A".
2. "Exhibit A", which is:

    a) a two-page "... list of that incorrect, fraudulent and other inaccuracies but not limited to the document "Memorandum of Decision" [the ***Anderson #1*** decision] produced by the living soul John Rooke who sometimes ACTs as Associate Chief Justice J.D. Rooke" [sic], and

    b) a copy of ***Anderson #1*** with handwritten annotations.
3. "Exhibit B", which is a copy of the May 3, 2021 letter from Counsel for the Defendants that referred Ms. Anderson's March 23, 2021 materials for CPN7 review. Unlike Exhibit A, this document is not annotated, nor does Ms. Anderson identify any defects or inaccuracies in that letter.

A. The "NOTICE: Trespass, Liability and Fee Schedule

[15] The "NOTICE" purports that Ms. Anderson's do-it-yourself "Anderson Court" has now been established, and holds authority over "all the living souls" named in its documents. Ms. Anderson alleges that myself and Counsel for the Defendants have "Trespassed on the case", a "public horrendous trespass", and demands that, within ten days, we provide, with a "wet signature", answers to why six Lentzian OPCA concepts are false, and also a certified *bona fide* copy of the "British North America "Act"" 1867". Ms. Anderson alleges there is no such thing. As a consequence, Ms. Anderson says I have no authority due to my purportedly defective oath of office. Presumably, that would apply to any other Canadian government official.

[16] The "NOTICE" states that if I (and Counsel for the Defendants) do not meet all seven criteria in ten days, then we are each fined 25 ounces of gold. Furthermore, the "NOTICE" also states that if anyone else dares in the future to interfere ("Trespass") with the "Anderson Court", then they will immediately be liable for first-offense fines of $250,000, then fines of $500,000, and also Ms. Anderson will demand a fee of: "... $1.00 per second in (gold/silver coin) ...".

[17] I will not be responding to Ms. Anderson's "NOTICE" and its demands for two reasons. First, the "NOTICE" is a well-known category of OPCA document, a foisted unilateral agreement. These documents purport to impose deadlines and obligations on individuals, and, that if certain criteria are not satisfied, silence then allegedly (but not actually, in law) creates a binding legally enforceable obligation, a status, or findings of fact and/or law. Foisted unilateral agreements have no legal effect in Canada: ***Meads*** at paras 447-528. They are "... an irrelevant monologue shouted at a brick wall.": ***Re Boisjoli***, 2015 ABQB 629 at para 49.

[18] While documents of this kind are always an abuse of court, one variation on this scheme, "fee schedules", are a particularly obnoxious subcategory. Ms. Anderson has unilaterally purported to set penalties for "Trespass" on the "Anderson Court". Interference with her self-proclaimed rights supposedly results in fines to be paid with precious metal coins. These are examples of fee schedule demands. Pseudolaw fee schedules are broadly recognized in law as a form of illegal intimidation: e.g. ***Meads*** at para 527; ***Fearn v Canada Customs***, 2014 ABQB 114 at para 199; ***Bank of Montreal v Rogozinsky***, 2014 ABQB 771 at para 78; ***Gidda v Hirsch***, 2014 BCSC 1286 at para 84; ***R v Sands***, 2013 SKQB 115 at para 18; ***R v Boxrud***, 2014 SKQB 221 at para 46; ***Re Boisjoli*** at paras 58-69; ***Allen Boisjoli Holdings v Papadoptu***, 2016 FC 1260; ***Pomerleau v Canada Revenue Agency***, 2017 ABQB 123 at para 135; ***Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v McDougald***, 2017 ABQB 124 at para 28; ***Gauthier v Starr***, 2016 ABQB 213 at para 39, aff'd 2018 ABCA 14; ***Re Gauthier***, 2017 ABQB 555 at paras 65-66, aff'd 2018 ABCA 14; ***Potvin (Re)***, 2018 ABQB 652 at paras 79-80; ***Knutson (Re)***, 2018 ABQB 858 at paras 61-62, court access restricted 2018 ABQB 1050 at para 18; ***DKD (Re) (Dependent Adult)***, 2018 ABQB 1021 at para 14; ***Labonte v Alberta Health Services***, 2019 ABQB 41 at paras 22-26; ***CP (Re)***, 2019 ABQB 310 at para 29. Ms. Anderson knows (or has ignored) that fee schedules are illegal intimidation. I directed her to review ***Meads*** in ***Anderson #1*** at para 36. She has no excuse for her actions.

[19] I conclude, on a balance of probabilities, that Ms. Anderson's "NOTICE" is intended to, at a minimum, threaten and intimidate myself and Counsel for the Defendants. Ms. Anderson's foisted unilateral threats have no legal basis. Further, I cannot be held liable for steps taken in discharging my judicial duties due to the principle of judicial immunity: ***Jordan v Nation***, 2013 ABCA 117, leave to appeal to SCC refused, 35405 (19 September 2013), citing ***Morier v Rivard***, [1985] 2 SCR 716, 23 DLR (4th) 1. Beyond that, as I concluded in ***Re Boisjoli*** at paras 59-69, attempts to claim and enforce spurious OPCA debts and fines against justice system participants are also a criminal offence: *Criminal Code*, s 423.1. I conclude, again on a balance of probabilities, that Ms. Anderson's "NOTICE", is an action contrary to *Criminal Code*, s 423.1.

[20] The second reason I will not respond to the seven demands in the "NOTICE" is that I have already explained to Ms. Anderson in ***Anderson #1*** why her claims are false, and there is no vigilante do-it-yourself "Anderson Court". Ms. Anderson has been told and shown why she is subject to Canadian law, just like everyone else.

[21] As for her demands for:

> ... a bona fide British North America Act of 1867 ... a certified copy of the British North America "Act" 1867 complete with the Royal Seal issued by Victoria Saxe-Coburg-Gotha.

Ms. Anderson gets it backwards. Legislation is *presumed* to be validly enacted: ***Kruger v R***, [1978] 1 SCR 104, 75 DLR (3d) 434, applied in an OPCA context in ***Sydel v HMTQ***, 2010 BCSC 638 at para 51, aff'd 2011 BCCA 233, leave to appeal to SCC refused, 34366 (22 December 2011); ***Fiander v Mills***, 2015 NLCA 31 at para 25; ***Fearn v Canada Customs*** at para 73. If Ms. Anderson thinks there is something wrong with the *British North America Act* (1867) (UK), 30 & 31 Vict, c 3, then it is up to her to establish that.

[22] I do not have to produce anything to Ms. Anderson to establish my authority and jurisdiction as a judge: ***R v Crischuk***, 2010 BCSC 716 at paras 36-38, aff'd 2010 BCCA 391; ***Fearn v Canada Customs*** at paras 83-87; ***Holmes v Canada***, 2016 FC 918 at paras 28, 30; ***R v Ainsworth***, 2015 ONCJ 98 at paras 3, 6; ***R v Rhodes***, 2015 BCSC 2437 at para 20; ***Servus Credit Union Ltd v Parlee***, 2015 ABQB 700 at para 40; ***R v Crischuk***, 2007 BCPC 470 at paras 8-9; ***Alberta Treasury Branches v Hawrysh***, 2018 ABQB 475 at para 23.

[23] In any case, I classify this complaint as falling into the same general category that the state is somehow dysfunctional, or has collapsed, due to a defect in a historical constitutional document, or Queen Elizabeth II's Coronation Oath: ***Meads*** at paras 298-299. Those claims are irrelevant. I agree with Bennett J, who concluded in ***Butterfield v LeBlanc***, 2007 BCSC 235 at paras 21-25 that, as of 1982, Canada is a country with its own constitution, and any alleged defects in statehood that predate that are irrelevant.

[24] In conclusion, Ms. Anderson's "NOTICE" demonstrates that she is an OPCA litigant, and that she is not going to reform her pseudolegal litigation misconduct. Ms. Anderson had the opportunity to participate in a valid legal process when ***Anderson #1*** invited her arguments as part of the CPN7 procedure. Instead, Ms. Anderson persists in her abuse of the Court via futile and plainly false claims to be operating her own vigilante do-it-yourself "Anderson Court". Worse, her persistent abusive litigation has now escalated, with Ms. Anderson targeting additional persons with threatening and retaliatory steps with the intention of intimidating those who might restrict or block her vigilante "Anderson Court" prosecutions.

[25] Ms. Anderson's "NOTICE" is an independent basis to strike out the March 23, 2021 filings and terminate this action. Ms. Anderson's obnoxious retaliatory attempts to discipline justice system participants are a reason Ms. Anderson may be subject to aggravated court sanctions, including elevated costs awards. Ms. Anderson is a litigation terrorist, a person who uses "... court processes to inflict harm on targets, intimidate, and empower themselves to dominate others": ***Unrau #2*** at para 230. Persons like Ms. Anderson, who use courts as weapons to harm others:

> ... should not be tolerated. When one of these malignant personalities is identified, public confidence in the judicial system will be severely taxed unless their "weaponized litigation" is brought under *immediate* and *effective* control. [***Unrau #2*** at para 238, emphasis in original.]

B. "Exhibit A"

[26] The "Exhibit A" "... list of that incorrect, fraudulent and other inaccuracies" [sic] and the annotated copy of ***Anderson #1*** makes it plain that Ms. Anderson does not agree with the

analysis and outcome in ***Anderson #1***. I will not respond on a point-by-point basis to "Exhibit A", since if Ms. Anderson disagrees with ***Anderson #1***, then Ms. Anderson should appeal that decision at the Alberta Court of Appeal. Nevertheless, I will review some of the content of "Exhibit A", since that is relevant to further illustrate Ms. Anderson's OPCA activities, and her continuing rejection of legitimate Canadian legal processes.

[27] First, Ms. Anderson denounces ***Anderson #1***, and has annotated it: "No consent", "No contract", "FORGED Document". Apparently, that invalidates ***Anderson #1***. "i, living soul, Sandra-Ann" says she is not in a contract with the Court, "... as i am not a licensed Bar attorney."

[28] Ms. Anderson claims that ***Anderson #1*** is a criminal document. She alleges ***Anderson #1***:

1. offends *Criminal Code* s 139(2) as "obstruction of Justice", i.e. obstruction of the imaginary "Anderson Court";
2. represents "constructive fraudulent conversion theft", contrary to *Criminal Code* ss 322(1-3), because use of Ms. Anderson's name requires permission of "i, living soul, Sandra-Ann";
3. defames Ms. Anderson's character, punishable under *Criminal Code* ss 298-301; and
4. the CPN7 process is obstruction of justice, pursuant to *Criminal Code*, s 139(3), because CPN7 limited Ms. Anderson's Written Submission to ten pages.

In relation to point three, in 2012 I observed, in ***Meads*** at para 504, that the idea the someone can own a name and exclude others from using it "... has an overwhelmingly juvenile character ...". The same is true today, despite Ms. Anderson circling every instance of her name in ***Anderson #1***, labelling that as "constructive Fraudulent converson SANDRA ANDERSON" [sic].

[29] Ms. Anderson denounces ***Anderson #1*** as being written neither in English or French, but in "... legalese, that only a licensed senior attorney can understand after attending 5 to 7 years of law school and using The Great Law Library as reference ...". She complains roman numerals used in ***Anderson #1*** headings are somehow "legalese". Ms. Anderson demands "... an experienced interpreter to also define the meaning of each word which can only be defined by the annotated commentaries of the Supreme Court of Canada decisions." I note this complaint appears overbroad. Surely, "horse" is not "legalese", as exclusively defined by the Supreme Court of Canada.

[30] Ms. Anderson also demands proof that a red ink fingerprint cannot be a signature. I note that in ***Anderson #1*** I never said a red ink fingerprint could not be a signature, however, that motif is not only a characteristic of Lentzian documents, but, for over twenty years, has been included in other worthless pseudolegal documents encountered in Canada: ***Meads*** at paras 215.

[31] None of Ms. Anderson's complaints and claims alters my conclusion that Ms. Anderson is an abusive OPCA litigant who claims to be outside Canadian law, and that Ms. Anderson has attempted to unilaterally enforce what she says is law in her do-it-yourself vigilante "Anderson Court". Instead, "Exhibit A" further confirms Ms. Anderson is "doubling down" on her claims to exercise non-existent pseudolaw rights.

[32] Mindful of my obligations to self-represented litigants such as Ms. Anderson, as endorsed by the Supreme Court of Canada in ***Pintea v Johns***, 2017 SCC 23, I again note to Ms. Anderson

that if she disagrees with ***Anderson #1***, and/or this decision, then she should take that complaint to the Alberta Court of Appeal.

III. Conclusion

[33] Ms. Anderson's Alberta Court of Queen's Bench Docket No. 2101 03903 action is struck out as an abuse of the Court pursuant to *Rule* 3.68 and CPN7 para 3(c). Ms. Anderson failed to rebut the *prima facie* OPCA defects identified in ***Anderson #1***. I, further, conclude that Ms. Anderson's "NOTICE" is a second, independent basis on which to strike out the Docket No. 2101 03903 action. Ms. Anderson is an abusive OPCA litigant who has deployed pseudolaw concepts to intimidate and threaten justice system participants.

[34] When an action is terminated via the CPN7 process, the usual practice of this Court is to award costs in favour of the litigant who referred the matter to the Court: e.g. ***Ahad v Calgary Housing Company***, 2020 ABQB 450 at para 9; ***Phillips v Kenney***, 2020 ABQB 452 at para 9; ***Skrypichayko v Law Society of Alberta***, 2020 ABQB 604 at para 43; ***Feeney v Alberta***, 2020 ABQB 633 at para 6. Successful litigants are presumptively due "Schedule C" costs, unless the Court orders otherwise: *Rule* 10.29(1).

[35] However, the Court has broad authority to order what it considers *appropriate* costs (*Rule* 10.31), and may consider in making that award litigation misconduct by a party, including whether a party:

1. unnecessarily lengthened a proceeding (*Rule* 10.33(2)(a)),
2. denied or refused to make admissions (*Rule* 10.33(2)(b)),
3. engaged in unnecessary and/or improper litigation (*Rule* 10.33(2)(d)),
4. filed irregular documents (*Rule* 10.33(2)(e)), and
5. "engaged in misconduct" (*Rule* 10.33(2)(g)).

[36] My findings in this matter appear to engage each of these categories. OPCA litigation is universally rejected as false, and an abuse of the court and responding litigants. Ms. Anderson was cautioned. She was shown her do-it-yourself vigilante "Anderson Court" had no basis in law. Nevertheless, Ms. Anderson did not alter course. Instead, Ms. Anderson has escalated her pseudolaw-based misconduct.

[37] I request Ms. Anderson explain why she should not be subject to an elevated cost award above the presumptive *Rules* "Schedule C" amount. Ms. Anderson has seven days after this decision to provide an up to five-page written submission as to why she should not be subject to an elevated costs award, given her abusive OPCA activities in the now terminated Docket No. 2101 03903 action.

[38] Counsel for the Defendants shall prepare and serve the court Order giving effect to this Decision. Ms. Anderson's approval of that Order is not required, pursuant to *Rule* 9.4(2)(c). Ms. Anderson may be served this Decision and that Order by email to the address listed on her filings: andersonasandra@gmail.com

Dated at the City of Calgary, Alberta this 1st day of June, 2021.

J.D. Rooke
A.C.J.C.Q.B.A.

Appearances:

Sandra Anderson
Self-represented Litigant

Cameron G. Regehr
Department of Justice
Prairie Region
for the Defendants

Appendix "A" - "NOTICE: Trespass, Liability and Fee Schedule

...

HIGH PRIORITY COMMUNICATION

Re: Notice: TRESPASS [Malfeasance, extortion, fraud, perjury, intimidation, breach of peace, aiding an abetting] and NOTICE: LIABILITY and FEE SCHEDULE

Anderson Court File #2101-03930

Date: May 27, 2021

NOTICE: Trespass, Liability and Fee Schedule

Good day,

This notice is based on good faith, and is intended to establish standing, and venue in this instant matter.

The following is not intended to be a complete recitation of all applicable law and/or facts. Furthermore, nor shall the following be deemed to constitute a waiver or relinquishment of any of my rights or remedies, all of which are hereby expressly reserved, including my right to all available remedies against living men and women who act as agents for said corporations;

To those whom serve we the people and act in rolls as Justices within government service corporations;

Trespass is occurring against we the people at our public courthouses by court staff, BAR members and Justices;

March 23, 2021 claim and Anderson court was established at Court of Queens Bench in the Courthouse in Calgary Alberta,...all the living souls named in the lawful [common law not legal] action and have been served properly and i am awaiting a response from each... 'Trespass on the case' occurred by l) Justice Rooke, a man who sometimes acts as associate chief justice for the Alberta Court of Queens Bench, who has no standing in 'Anderson Court' moving under the common law; (See attached Exhibit A, Memorandum of Decision by Justice Rooke on May 13, 2021) and by 2) Cam Regehr, a man who sometimes acts as counsel for the Department of Justice Canada / Government of Canada.

i, require post haste written verifiable evidence with wet signature 'findings of facts and conclusions of Law' if the following 7 facts that i claim below NOT be true...otherwise correct Anderson courthouse staff/Bar members in writing/on record;

i, claim:

1. Anderson Courthouse is a public courthouse for we the people to access and move court and claim, not private for BAR members only.
2. Courthouse staff/Bar Members, Justices or any man and woman in this country cannot block or deny access to move claim & court outside of legal jurisdiction and All

honourable people who act as justices have no jurisdiction over a man or woman whom they serve;

3. No (wo]man acting as court staff/public servants/Justice at Public Courthouse will claim i, property;
4. No (wo]man can administrate property [Anderson Court/claim] without right;
5. The Alberta Rules of Court do NOT apply to we the people promogulated by a private society;
6. No obligation [contract] or law exists we the people are bound or under Alberta Rules of Court in order to access a public courthouse and move claim and court before a jury of our peers to render a decision and seek administration of justice;
7. i: the living soul: Sandra-Ann require a true, certified, signed copy of the British North America Act [BNA] from the House of Lords located in London from said living soul acting as Judge Rooke in this instance to evidence their/your jurisdiction/authority, evidencing agency.

   In other words: If there is a bona fide British North America Act of 1867, i pray you to provide me a certified copy of the British North America "Act" 1867 complete with the Royal Seal issued by Victoria Saxe-Coburg-Gotha.

   If not produced Since the British North America Bill 1867 failed to receive Royal Assent, and since judges appointed to the Superior Courts are appointed through section 96 of the British North America Bill 1867, and as section 96 fails, are the judges, appointed to the Superior courts, reliant on their oath of office to Elizabeth? i pray for production of such.

Failure to produce evidence required in this matter as stated above...requires case to move forward and continued, verified trespass

Notice: Liability as shown in the filing also applies to every man or woman on this communication;

i... will affirm under oath that all here in be true.

i, give 10 days to produce written reply with verifiable evidence with wet signature to 7 points as stated above;

If not evidence is produced to all 7 facts above:

i pray for relief of this public horrendous trespass committed by the living soul, acting as Judge Rooke, i.e. lacking agency, malfeasance, breach of contract [statement of claim] administering property without right. fraud, forgery, defamation of character but not limited to:

i pray for relief of this public horrendous trespass committed by the living soul, acting as Prosecuting attorney, i.e. aiding and abetting in lacking agency, malfeasance, breach of contract [statement of claim] administering property without right, fraud, forgery, defamation of character but not limited to:

a) i pray for a private written apology by both living souls, John Rooke and Cam Regehr, private delivery, i.e. Purolator or FedEx;

b) i pray for the removal of the written trespass dated May 13th, 2021 by the living soul, acting as Judge Rooke from Twitter, Canlii, all social media, but not limited to, or officially publicly retracted;

c) i pray for compensation [privately] for the stress and duress plus costs caused by said public horrendous trespass by both living souls, John Rooke and Cam Regehr, in the amount of 25oz (ounces) of gold coin each by private delivery, i.e. Purolator or FedEx;

d) i pray for the opportunity to amend my initial "statement of claim" (2101 03903) or to start over, against the original trespassers and to follow lawful and equitable procedure, the following shall not be deemed to constitute a waiver or relinquishment of any of my inalienable, unalienable creator given rights or remedies, all of which are hereby expressly reserved, including my right to all available remedies against the living souls acting as agents for said corporations.

Further Trespass from this point on:

Trespass fine is set at $250,000 per living soul involved;

FINES-INCREASE-BY-$500,000.00-FOR-EACH-ADDITIONAL-TRESPASS.

Any Judgement/Orders given against me, the wo/man, a living soul, also against my private property (Statement of Claim) let it be known my fee is $1.00 per second in (gold/silver coin) to comply where no contract exists prior.

My counselor at law confirmed if trespass occurs again by people under your control on any trespass/fines will be enforced/court moved against all;

Ignorance of the law [not legal] which does not apply to we the people [living souls] is no excuse for public servants;

This communication is of public record and your collective duty to act with your honour is on the line;

Judicium a non suo judice nullius est moment - A judgment pronounced by a judge to decide in a matter falling within his jurisdiction is of no effect.

ATTESTMENT

Under the penalty of perjury, i attest that to the best of my current knowledge, understanding and belief, all matters of law and fact set forth herein are accurate and true, so help me God.

Genesis 2 Verse 7 - And the LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.

No man is above the law

Theodore Roosevelt

Failure to respond/promptly will be deemed a dishonour of this NOTICE

NOTICE-TO-PRINCIPAL-1S-NOITCE-TO-AGENT
NOTICE-TO-AGENT-IS-NOTICE-TO-PRINCIPAL

Kind regards,
[Sandra-Ann handwritten, ink fingerprint]
i:woman: Sandra [of the Anderson family]

...