244069-3-B, 244069-4-BC Vancouver Registry

In the Provincial Court of British Columbia (BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUDGE SUTHERLAND)

Vancouver, B.C. April 10, 2019

REGINA

٧.

PATRICK HENRY FOX

PROCEEDINGS AT JUDICIAL INTERIM RELEASE HEARING

244069-3-B, 244069-4-BC Vancouver Registry

In the Provincial Court of British Columbia (BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUDGE SUTHERLAND)

Vancouver, B.C. April 10, 2019

REGINA

٧.

PATRICK HENRY FOX

PROCEEDINGS AT JUDICIAL INTERIM RELEASE HEARING

BAN ON PUBLICATION 517(1) CCC

Crown Counsel: P. Tomasson

Appearing on his own behalf: Patrick Fox

201134.April 10 19.JIR

INDEX

SUBMISSIONS FOR CROWN BY MS. TOMASSON:	10
SUBMISSIONS BY THE ACCUSED:	27
EXHIBITS	
EXHIBIT 1: JUSTIN conviction list for Patrick Henry Fox	11
EXHIBIT 2: Probation Order that arose from the sentencing hearing	
EXHIBIT 3: Photocopy of R. v. Fox [2017] B.C.J. No. 2619, British Columbia and Yukon Judgments, British Columbia Supreme Court	
EXHIBIT 5: Photocopy of Order, Court File 244069 Vancouver Provincial Court Registry, Her Majesty the Queen v. Patrick Fox, Before the	
Honourable Justice Burgess on Friday, the 7th day of October, 2016	27
EXHIBIT 6: Photocopy of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada Access to Information and Privacy Division, letter dated March 27, 2018, "All Records concerning REISS, Richard AKA FOX, Patrick Henry"	32
EXHIBIT 7: Photocopy of British Columbia Ministry of Social Development and Poverty Reduction Employment and Assistance Request for	0 2
Reconsideration, Requestor's Name Patrick Fox	39
DUI INCS	
RULINGS	
[REASONS AT JUDICIAL INTERIM RELEASE HEARING]	50

```
1
                                 Vancouver, B.C.
2
                                 April 10, 2019
4
    MS. TOMASSON: Just waiting for Mr. Fox, Your Honour.
5
    THE COURT: Sir, you're Mr. Fox?
    THE ACCUSED: Yes, I am.
6
7
                Thank you.
    THE COURT:
8
    MS. TOMASSON: Yes, Your Honour, for the record, Patti
9
         Tomasson appearing for the Crown. Calling the
10
         matter of Patrick Fox.
                                  This matter is for bail
         hearing today, Your Honour.
11
12
               And just to provide you with a bit of
13
         background, because Mr. Fox first appeared -- Mr.
14
          Fox, I believe you can sit down --
15
                  Actually, before we begin, may I borrow a
    THE ACCUSED:
16
         pen from someone.
17
    MS. TOMASSON: I have brought --
18
    THE ACCUSED: I'm not allowed to bring --
19
    MS. TOMASSON: -- a pen and paper for Mr. Fox.
20
    THE ACCUSED: Great, thank you. And I would like to
21
         again, before we begin, I'd like to express my
22
          strong opposition to the publication ban that was
23
         ordered last week. I oppose any publication bans
24
         whatsoever, and the Crown had requested it,
25
          supposedly on my behalf, but I certainly would not
26
         want any publication bans in place. Can we -- is
27
         it possible to have that vacated?
28
    THE COURT: Well, I'll tell you what, we'll -- we'll
29
          get to that in a moment.
30
    THE ACCUSED: Sure.
31
    THE COURT: I'll just let Ms. Tomasson finish
32
          introducing herself --
33
    THE ACCUSED: Thank you.
34
               -- and giving me just a little bit of a lay
    THE COURT:
35
          of the land where things start.
36
    MS. TOMASSON: Yes, Your Honour. Mr. Fox first
37
          appeared in custody on -- last Friday, and at that
38
          time he appeared initially in courtroom 101 where
39
         he expressed his desire to represent himself -
40
         duty counsel did speak with him - and then we went
41
         up to a court for a bail hearing and another judge
42
         went through with him in detail what was going to
43
         happen, the Crown was seeking his detention and
44
         that -- strongly advised him to seek
45
         representation.
46
               He spoke with duty counsel again and chose
47
         not to represent himself. That took some time.
```

Proceedings

BAN ON PUBLICATION 517(1) CCC

And then, we were in front of a third judge who again strongly advised him to seek some representation, and in fact, duty counsel was there that afternoon.

Mr. Fox chose on all occasions not to represent himself. He appeared in courtroom 101 this morning and expressed to the judge there that he wanted to represent himself. That is why he is here representing himself, Your Honour.

At the last hearing on Friday there was -- I made an application on his behalf, that is correct, under Section 517 for a publication ban. In the Crown's submission, that is appropriate in these circumstances where there will be a bail hearing.

The allegations are breaches of probation, but we will be discussing the underlying circumstances of the last conviction that are quite serious, and in relation to these proceedings, the Crown is of the opinion that it is in his best interest.

Mr. Fox, from time-to-time, has stated things that are not in his best interest and for those to be published in the media, in the Crown's submission, would be detrimental to him.

There is also an outstanding investigation that I will be speaking of, and I would not want that to prejudice what might be further charges against Mr. Fox, which may not be in front of a provincial court judge, but may be.

Last time he was in court, Your Honour, on the criminal harassment and firearms charges, he chose to represent himself in a jury trial, and so I would not want, if there are further charges coming out, that any of these proceedings be in the media prior to conviction.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Fox, I'm going to address two things with you. Firstly - so just stand up - I understand that you were in court, from what Ms. Tomasson said, on Friday, April 5th, and you wanted counsel to assist you.

You're here today saying that you're prepared to represent yourself. Did you want counsel to assist you today?

THE ACCUSED: No, no, I did not. I also did not Friday of last week. I spoke briefly with the duty -- duty counsel, and I think that that was sufficient

```
for me to decide that I definitely did not want
2
          duty counsel representing me.
3
    THE COURT: Did you want to -- okay, but maybe not duty
4
         counsel, but did you want some time to see if you
5
          could procure other counsel?
6
    THE ACCUSED: I am 100 percent confident that any
7
          lawyer that would represent me that would be paid
8
         by LSS, would absolutely not operate in my
9
         interests, based on my experience with the three
10
         lawyers that I've dealt with previously in this
11
         matter.
12
    THE COURT: All right. What about -- and I don't want
13
          to get into this too much --
14
    THE ACCUSED: Mm-hmm.
15
    THE COURT: -- but you've mentioned lawyers provided to
16
          you through LSS, Legal Services Society.
17
         about privately retaining counsel, is that
18
          something you're interested in, or -- or
19
          specifying with Legal Services Society, which
20
          lawyer you would like and speaking to that lawyer
21
         to see if they would take it on a Legal Services
22
         Society retainer?
23
    THE ACCUSED: I would be open to that, and again, my
24
         experience has been that it seems that lawyers
25
          from outside of the Vancouver area, I would have
26
         much more confidence in.
27
    THE COURT: Lawyers from --
28
    THE ACCUSED: Not --
29
    THE COURT: -- outside Vancouver?
30
    THE ACCUSED: Right, right, because from -- from what
31
          I've seen, discussing the matter with other people
32
         who have had similar experiences to what I have
33
         had, it seems that lawyers from outside of the
34
         Vancouver area are much more likely to raise the
35
         issues that have been going on in my case -- well,
36
         that I say have been going on in my case.
37
         ineffective assistance, etc., the collusion
38
         between the Crown counsel and the defence
39
         attorney, etc.
    THE COURT: Okay. Well, given -- let's -- let's talk
40
41
         about this a little bit more. Given the stakes,
42
         and the stakes are high, obviously, your liberty
43
         is -- is at interest in this bail hearing. Just
44
         hear me out for a second.
45
    THE ACCUSED: Yeah, yeah.
46
    THE COURT: I don't want to push on unless you are 100
47
         percent comfortable and confident that you,
```

Proceedings

BAN ON PUBLICATION 517(1) CCC

through counsel, if that's how you'd like to do it, are able to put your best foot forward, because as has probably been explained to you, you don't -- you don't have opportunities for bail as of right, once you are detained.

So, for example, if you run a bail hearing and the court detains you, then you have limited options to get back in front of the court to reapply for bail, because the review would need to take place up at Supreme Court, transcripts need to be ordered, that takes time for scheduling. Or in the alternative, Crown counsel would have to agree and that's something within their discretion that you may not have any control over. Or, you would have to at least wait 90 days before you could possibly get back before.

So the stakes are high, and I don't -- I'm reluctant to have you forge ahead unless you think that the best possible case can be put forward for your release.

So prefacing my next question with those comments, do you want a little bit of time to see, to speak to lawyers privately, or to see if (a) you can afford one; or (b) if they were taken on a Legal Services retainer? It could be counsel from outside of the Lower Mainland, if that's where your confidence lies.

THE ACCUSED: Allow me to say, before I answer that directly, since I have no status in Canada, I would think that I would inherently be a flight risk. I am not a Canadian citizen. My presence in Canada is illegal. So given that, I find it highly unlikely I'm going to be granted bail anyway.

And even if I was released on bail, I'm not authorized to work in Canada, I have no place to go, so I'm not even sure that I would -- I don't want to say I don't want to be released. It's just that if I am released, I'm in a much worse situation than I am staying in jail. And even if there were no proba -- or bail conditions, there's still the probation conditions which prohibit me from leaving a country that I have no status in, that I'm not allowed to work in.

I mean, the whole thing seems to me to be an incredible farce, just keep me in jail, what's the point?

```
THE COURT: Well, ultimately that's another option, you
2
         can consent to remain in jail.
3
    THE ACCUSED: Well, I certainly don't want to consent,
         and then later people are going to say, oh, well,
5
         you consented to it, you know. So I have to fight
6
         it as much as I can, just so I can say --
7
    THE COURT:
                Okay.
8
    THE ACCUSED: -- I did everything I could.
9
    THE COURT: I -- I understand. Do you want to have
10
         counsel assist you in that process, or do you feel
11
         that you want to go ahead on your own today?
12
    THE ACCUSED: I honestly don't think it's going to make
13
         any difference either way. So I might as well
14
         just do it on my own. And I say all this with the
15
         utmost respect for the court.
16
    THE COURT: No, and I --
17
    THE ACCUSED: I'm not trying --
18
    THE COURT: You know --
19
    THE ACCUSED: -- to be disrespectful.
20
    THE COURT: And, Mr. Fox, nothing you've said is
21
         disrespectful to the court, so --
22
    THE ACCUSED: Okav.
    THE COURT: -- so I appreciate that. I don't take any
23
24
         -- any offence to anything you said.
25
              Well, I'm -- I can't give you legal advice --
26
    THE ACCUSED: Mm-hmm.
27
    THE COURT: -- obviously, so I -- I'm going to stop my
28
         inquiries there. I think I've expressed my
29
         concerns to you, which probably echo the same
30
         concerns that other judges said, which is the
31
         stakes are high at a bail hearing. Your liberty
32
         is at stake. It's important to put your best foot
33
         forward. I can't tell you -- I can't give you
34
                        If you're saying, look at, I just
         legal advice.
35
         want to go ahead, and this is how you've
36
         rationalized going ahead, this is how you've
37
         explained to me, I can't deny you the right to
38
         have a bail hearing. And so if that's what you
39
         prefer to do, then we'll have your bail hearing.
40
    THE ACCUSED: Okay.
41
    THE COURT: Okay, you're comfortable with that?
42
    THE ACCUSED: Yes, I am. Thank you.
43
    THE COURT: Okay.
44
    THE ACCUSED: Um --
45
                         Now we'll move on to the
    THE COURT: Thanks.
46
         publication ban, but just have a seat --
47
    THE ACCUSED: Sure.
```

```
1
    THE COURT: -- for one second. I just want to read the
2 3
          -- I just want to read 517 one more time.
         just going to read the section, Mr. Fox, again,
4
         with respect to the publication ban.
5
              Ms. Tomasson --
6
    MS. TOMASSON: Yes, Your Honour?
7
    THE COURT: -- you've expressed the reason why the
8
         Crown applied for a publication ban, which was
9
         essentially bending over to assist Mr. Fox --
10
    MS. TOMASSON: Yes, Your
                -- today and going forward?
11
    THE COURT:
12
    MS. TOMASSON:
                   Yes.
13
    THE COURT: Actually, sorry, have a seat. I'll hear
14
          from Mr. Fox --
15
                   Certainly, but --
    MS. TOMASSON:
16
    THE COURT:
                -- again for a second --
17
    MS. TOMASSON: -- in terms of --
18
    THE COURT: -- unless there's something you want to
19
         add.
20
    MS. TOMASSON: Certainly. But in terms of the section,
21
         since it directs a court to -- that they shall,
22
         that's why the Crown made the application on
23
         behalf of the accused, but we are making the
24
         application on behalf of the Crown and it's a
25
         discretionary order.
26
    THE COURT:
                Yes.
27
    MS. TOMASSON: And so, we are asking for it.
28
    THE COURT:
                Okay.
29
    MS. TOMASSON:
                   Thank you.
30
    THE COURT: I'm glad you clarified that because that's
31
          -- that was on my mind --
32
    MS. TOMASSON: Thank you.
33
                -- as I just read the section.
    THE COURT:
34
              Mr. Fox, you heard the Crown's justification
35
         for seeking a publication ban. It's a concern for
36
         your status today and going forward with respect
37
         to details that were -- that are about to be
38
         discussed at this bail hearing being published in
39
         the media, and potential problems that may exist
40
          for you as a result. Have you changed your view
41
         having heard that?
42
    THE ACCUSED: I have not, and I'm quite certain that
43
         any -- any information or evidence that might come
44
         up at this bail hearing, most likely is already
45
         publicly assessible on the website anyway.
46
         mean, aside from any false allegations --
47
    THE COURT: Okay.
```

```
THE ACCUSED: -- or completely unfounded allegations
2
         that the Crown might make. Those obviously would
3
         not be.
4
    THE COURT: Tell me this, out of curiosity --
5
    THE ACCUSED: Certainly.
6
    THE COURT: -- because most people err on the side of
7
          caution, they don't want that information out
8
          there.
9
    THE ACCUSED:
                 Mm-hmm.
10
    THE COURT: They don't want that information out there
         because once it's out there, they've lost all
11
12
          control. Why do you -- why are you saying no
13
         publication ban?
14
    THE ACCUSED: I want everything in this matter, just
15
         like with the trial before it, to be completely
16
         public because I don't believe that I committed
17
         any crime, I don't believe I committed criminal
18
         criminal harassment.
19
               The only way the Crown was able to get the
20
         conviction was by having the defence attorney,
21
         Tony Lagemaat, that was forced on me against my
22
         objections, to do the cross-examination, to
23
         collude with Mr. Myhre to suppress a huge amount
24
         of evidence at the trial, and the proof in the
25
         evidence of that also has already been published
26
         on the website, so that's all publicly assessible
27
         at this point.
28
    THE COURT: Well, I gather there's also an outstanding
29
          investigation that's going to be referred to
30
         that's not out there, and --
31
    THE ACCUSED: I --
32
    THE COURT: -- maybe nothing comes of it --
33
    THE ACCUSED: Mm-hmm.
34
    THE COURT: -- and yet it could all be published and it
35
         could stain you with information published on line
36
          on -- potentially on the internet --
37
    THE ACCUSED: Mm-hmm.
38
    THE COURT: -- that never amounts to anything but the
39
          stain remains. And that's something that I'm sure
40
          you don't want to --
41
    THE ACCUSED:
                 Um --
42
    THE COURT:
               -- risk.
43
                   I understand that, and with respect to
    THE ACCUSED:
44
         that supposed investigation, I would insist, or
45
         even demand, that the Crown charge me with
46
         criminal harassment again for putting that website
47
         back up, and I would insist that they charge me
```

```
with violating probation for putting that website
2
         back up, because if I did put that website up, it
3
         would violate the probation order.
               I would very much look forward to having
5
         another trial for criminal harassment based on
6
         that website.
7
              And --
8
    THE COURT: Okay.
9
    THE ACCUSED: -- I know that the news media is only
10
         going to write one side of this. They're only
         going to write the stuff that makes me look very
11
12
         bad. That's historically what they've done so far
13
         in this matter.
14
              But I still have the freedom and the
15
         opportunity to publish the rest of the story that
16
         the news media doesn't write, which, again, is on
17
         the website. I --
18
    THE COURT: All right. Well -- well perhaps what I'll
19
         do --
20
    THE ACCUSED: Sure.
    THE COURT: -- in re -- if you asked for the
21
22
         publication ban, it would be mandatory that I
23
         would have to impose it. Crown counsel asks for
24
         the publication ban, it's discretionary, so it's
25
         -- I don't have to impose it.
26
              Quite frankly, I'm in a total vacuum.
27
         don't know the circumstances at all. I'm going to
28
         hear them real soon, so I don't really know what's
29
         at play.
30
    THE ACCUSED: Mm-hmm.
31
    THE COURT: Why don't I hold off -- Ms. Tomasson,
32
         what's the downside to me deferring my decision on
33
         the publication ban?
34
                   Well, there is currently --
    MS. TOMASSON:
35
    THE COURT:
                What am I --
36
    MS. TOMASSON:
                   There is currently --
37
    THE COURT: What am I --
38
    MS. TOMASSON: -- a publication ban in place.
39
    THE COURT: Yeah.
                       Yeah.
40
                   What I think --
    MS. TOMASSON:
41
                I think it's --
    THE COURT:
    MS. TOMASSON:
42
                   -- Mr. Fox is asking --
43
    THE COURT: -- removing --
44
    MS. TOMASSON: -- is removing that.
45
    THE COURT:
                Yeah.
46
    MS. TOMASSON: And so at this point, there is no
47
         downside because it will remain in effect unless
```

```
you change it.
2
    THE COURT:
                Yeah.
3
    MS. TOMASSON:
                   And so, any submissions I make, or any
          submissions Mr. Fox makes at this time is still
5
          covered by the ban.
6
                No, I appreciate that, but --
    THE COURT:
7
    MS. TOMASSON: So I don't --
8
                -- what's the down --
    THE COURT:
9
    MS. TOMASSON: I don't think there's any downside to
10
          deferring your decision until you know more about
11
          it.
12
    THE COURT:
                 That's what I'm going to do.
13
    MS. TOMASSON: Yes.
14
    THE COURT: You know what, Mr. Fox, I think what I'm
15
          going to do is because I'm in a vacuum, and I do
16
         have a responsibility to ensure, obviously,
17
          fairness for you and fairness to the Crown, and
18
          fairness to the public. These courts belong to
19
          the public. They're -- they're not my courts, or
20
          your courts.
21
               And I'm in a bit of a vacuum.
                                              I -- quite
22
          frankly, I know the outstanding charges against
23
          you, because I've been handed them up, but I know
24
          nothing about your case.
25
               So what I'm going to do is I'm going to leave
26
          it status quo and I'll defer my decision until I
27
         hear a little bit more, okay?
28
     THE ACCUSED: Certainly.
29
     THE COURT: All right, you're comfortable with that,
30
          good.
                Okay.
31
    MS. TOMASSON: Yes, Your Honour, and there's one more
32
          preliminary matter. At the last date, as well,
33
         Mr. Fox requested that the Crown obtain some
34
          documents that had been -- he had provided to the
35
          Crown at a bail variation to -- rather a probation
36
          variation hearing that was set in March in Supreme
37
          Court, and so those documents I have obtained for
38
         Mr. Fox. That was one of the main reasons why we
39
          adjourned the bail hearing from last date, and
40
          I've got copies for him and I just wanted to put
41
          -- give those to him on the record --
42
    THE COURT: Yeah.
43
    MS. TOMASSON:
                   -- so that it's --
44
    THE COURT: Yeah.
45
    MS. TOMASSON: And what I've done is I've provided
46
          -- I've got copies that he can provide the court
47
          with should he want to use this material --
```

```
THE COURT: Okay.
2
    MS. TOMASSON: -- during this hearing.
3
    THE ACCUSED: Thank you.
    MS. TOMASSON: And I just would like Mr. Fox to go
5
         through that and confirm that those are the
6
         documents that he was requesting.
7
    THE ACCUSED: Yes. Yes, they are. This one won't be
8
         necessary for this though. I'm -- I'm just
9
         letting you know, I'm -- you have --
10
    THE COURT:
               You -- you --
    MS. TOMASSON: But is --
11
12
    THE COURT: -- you can hang --
    THE ACCUSED: I'll just put that --
13
14
    THE COURT: -- onto it if you want, or you --
15
    THE ACCUSED: -- aside, yeah.
16
    THE COURT: -- could give it back to Ms. Tomasson.
17
    THE ACCUSED: Right.
18
    MS. TOMASSON: If -- if you don't require that, I'll
19
         take that back.
20
    THE ACCUSED: Well, I will require that later at the
21
         probation -- or at the hearing in the violation
22
         matter.
23
    THE COURT: All right. Ms. Tomasson, are you ready to
24
         proceed?
25
    MS. TOMASSON: Yes, I am, Your Honour.
26
    THE COURT: You've got a pen. You've got a pad there.
27
    THE ACCUSED:
                  I do, thank you.
28
    THE COURT: You're ready to make notes.
29
30
    SUBMISSIONS FOR CROWN BY MS. TOMASSON:
31
32
    MS. TOMASSON: Yes, Your Honour. Mr. Fox is in custody
33
         on three counts of breach of probation, and in the
34
         Crown's submission, Mr. Fox should be detained on
35
         the primary, secondary and tertiary grounds.
36
              At first blush, Your Honour may be wondering
37
         why it is that the Crown is seeking his detention
38
         on what are usually not charges in which we seek
39
         detention. But these charges arise out of a
40
         Supreme Court order, which I will hand up to Your
41
         Honour at this time, and I will provide copies to
42
         Mr. Fox.
43
               The first document --
44
    THE COURT: Thank you.
45
    MS. TOMASSON: -- is the conviction list, and I'd ask
46
         that be marked as the first exhibit on the bail
47
         hearing. That is the -- Mr. Fox's Canadian
```

THE ACCUSED: Thank you.

Submissions for Crown by Ms. Tomasson

BAN ON PUBLICATION 517(1) CCC

criminal record. As you'll see, he was convicted on November 10th, 2017 of criminal harassment and 2 3 possession of firearms, and he was sentenced to three years and 10 months. 5 EXHIBIT 1: JUSTIN conviction list for 7 Patrick Henry Fox 8 9 MS. TOMASSON: This next document is the probation 10 order that arose from the sentencing hearing. I'd ask that be marked as Exhibit 2 in these 11 12 proceedings. 13 14 EXHIBIT 2: Probation Order that arose from 15 the sentencing hearing 16 17 MS. TOMASSON: And the conditions that we are dealing 18 with are Condition 5, in which he was to report 19 every four days to his probation officer; 20 Condition 9, in which he was prohibited from 21 leaving the Province of British Columbia, and 22 Condition 10 that he was not to be within 100 23 metres of the United States border. 24 THE COURT: So, Mr. Fox, these documents have been --25 Crown counsel's asking that they be marked as 26 exhibits. That just means that they form part of 27 the evidence that ultimately I'll base my decision 28 on. I take it you have no problem with me looking 29 at these documents and --30 THE ACCUSED: That's correct. I --31 THE COURT: -- considering them? 32 THE ACCUSED: -- have no opposition. THE COURT: All right, t hank you. Are the copies that 33 34 I have, are they for me, or --35 MS. TOMASSON: Yes, they are. 36 THE COURT: Okay, so I can mark them up? 37 MS. TOMASSON: Yes, Your Honour. 38 THE COURT: Okay, thank you. 39 MS. TOMASSON: Now, in order to understand the 40 seriousness of the breaches, Your Honour, I will 41 be going through the circumstances of the 42 underlying convictions, and in that regard I'll 43 hand up a copy of the sentencing decision, and 44 again, there's a copy for an exhibit, a copy for 45 Your Honour, and, of course, I'll provide Mr. Fox 46 with his own copy.

46

47

Submissions for Crown by Ms. Tomasson

BAN ON PUBLICATION 517(1) CCC

MS. TOMASSON: I'd ask that be marked as the next 2 exhibit. 3 THE COURT: Mr. Fox, you have no problem with me looking at the decision? It's public, in any 5 event. 6 THE ACCUSED: No, I don't. 7 THE COURT: Thank you. 8 THE ACCUSED: Thank you. 9 MS. TOMASSON: Now, this 10 THE COURT: All right. So the decision will be Exhibit 11 3. 12 Thank you, Your Honour. MS. TOMASSON: 13 14 EXHIBIT 3: Photocopy of R. v. Fox [2017] 15 B.C.J. No. 2619, British Columbia and Yukon 16 Judgments, British Columbia Supreme Court 17 18 MS. TOMASSON: Now, these breach charges arise out of 19 this Supreme Court order which was imposed on Mr. 20 Fox after he was convicted of criminal harassment 21 of his ex-wife and firearms offences. 22 Now, at paragraph 5 of that decision at page 23 3 in the sentencing decision, in relation to the 24 criminal harassment, the court provides a brief 25 overview [as read in]: 26 27 Mr. Fox conducted a campaign to, as he put 28 it, make Ms. Capuano's life as miserable as 29 possible, hoping to drive her to suicide if 30 that could be done within the confines of the 31 law. 32 33 And, I'm quoting from paragraph 5, Your Honour. 34 35 It was a campaign conducted by means of 36 hundreds - probably thousands - of emails he 37 sent her, and sometimes to people she knew, 38 as well as by means of a website he created 39 in her name. These communications were 40 designed to embarrass and humiliate 41 Ms. Capuano by disseminating personal 42 information about her, to undermine her 43 relationships with her family members, 44 friends, and employers and work colleagues,

to ruin her financially by preventing her

from keeping or gaining employment, and

generally to intimidate her.

Now, Ms. Capuano and the accused had been in a relationship. They were married. They had one child together. And after they separated, there was a custody battle over the child, and as a result of that, Mr. Fox, who at that time he was — although Mr. Fox ha ssaid that he's a U.S. citizen, he is not in the Crown's submission. He's a Canadian citizen, born in Sudbury, Ontario.

The name in which he was born under was Richard Reis, R-e-i-s, and Mr. Fox, when he returned to Canada, changed his name to the name upon which he's convicted under, Patrick Fox, and has continued to maintain that he is, in fact, a United States citizen for an -- very number of years.

The last exhibit I will be handing up is a decision from his conviction in the United States, and I'll just be referring to the first page under "Background" on the right-hand side of the page [as read in]:

On November 5, 2008, following a jury trial, the jury returned verdicts of -- on both counts alleged against

As he -- he was then named, Mr. Reis, and he was convicted of perjury and a false claim of citizenship.

And what had occurred is that during a court proceeding before an Immigration judge in October of 2007, he took an oath to testify truthfully and at that hearing he was found to have said that he — he alleged he was a United States citizen. That was found to be false.

He was sentenced to 24 months in prison and three years of supervised release.

 Now, after returning to Canada he set up over the course of a number of years a website, and this is detailed at paragraph 13, page 4 of the decision.

THE COURT: Sorry, of which decision?

 MS. TOMASSON: Of the Fox, the sentencing decision on criminal harassment. The sentencing decision of Judge Holmes at paragraph 13, page 4 [as read in]:

The website includes personal details about

Ms. Capuano, as well as purportedly biographical details and information about her character, preferences, and history. It includes dozens, probably hundreds, of photographs of Ms. Capuano in various aspects of her life, sometimes also showing her children (including her younger son in his underwear), her current partner and her previous partners, and the interior of her The website details the location of home. the home, with maps. The website also details the history of the custody dispute, from Mr. Fox's perspective, and includes copies of the vast email correspondence between him and Ms. Capuano.

Another section of the website focuses, individual by individual, on the people associated with Ms. Capuano. These include her younger son (S.), her mother and her father, her current partner and his mother, and dozens of her friends and work associates. A photograph of each person is shown, together with contact information and a description in, it seems, as much detail as Mr. Fox was able to gather.

And I'll pause here that his background is in IT, so he is very familiar with computers and how to gain information.

Continuing on at paragraph 16 [as read in]:

A further section purports to detail contact, by Ms. Capuano and people associated with her, with courts of different types of jurisdictions in the USA.

Finally, a series of dozens of blogs or posts, most of them purportedly written by Ms. Capuano, contains content designed to humiliate and degrade her. For example, one post has Ms. Capuano purportedly declaring, in some detail, raging hatred of people of non-white ethnic background. Another post, entitled, "An Open Letter to All Prospective Employers: Why You Should Hire Me", speaks sarcastically and in vulgar language

(purportedly in her voice) about why she should be hired, the given "reasons" about all weighing heavily against her (i.e. "I've never accepted responsibility for everything -- which is okay because so far there's always been someone else to blame it on").

Now, this went on for some time with Ms. Capuano trying to get the authorities to do something which ultimately resulted in the laying of the Indictment which had about a year-and-ahalf of the conduct, but there was conduct prior to that.

But at paragraph 21 the court details an email that he sent in July of 2014 concerning his intent in relation to the website, and I quote [as read in]:

I will destroy you-slowly and incrementally ...[e] very moment of my life is focused on the single goal.

At paragraph 23, detailing another email he sent to her in December of 2014:

I know that the best way to hurt you, permanently, is emotionally, not through your reputation, finances, or career (remember I told you many months ago that that other stuff I was going to do was just to distract you?). And what could be more effective than for your child to utterly despise you because of your own actions?

And then, at paragraph 25 [as read in]:

Indeed, most of Mr. Fox's emails to
Ms. Capuano, no matter the subject, was also
sent to G.

Which is the child; their child by that marriage.

This compounded the humiliation Mr. Fox caused Ms. Capuano, and damaged her relationship with G. It no doubt also caused psychological harm to G. as well.

Submissions for Crown by Ms. Tomasson BAN ON PUBLICATION 517(1) CCC

Ms. Capuano did end up losing her employment, and at paragraph 27 [as read in]:

Mr. Fox delighted in Ms. Capuano's loss of her employment. In an email in November 2015, he said: "You will soon be homeless; you have no money; nobody believes anything you say anymore; nobody is coming to your aid or defense; you will not be able to secure another job as long as that website exists - and it's not going anywhere as long as you're alive".

At paragraph 29 the court commented:

The harassment --

THE Halassment

THE COURT: Hang on one sec, Ms. Tomasson.

MS. TOMASSON: Certainly.

THE COURT: Mr. Fox, do -- I should have explained to you at the outset how the proceedings work --

THE ACCUSED: Well, I --

THE COURT: -- and you may be -- you may have some familiarity with it already, but Crown counsel is seeking your detention so they need to establish --

THE ACCUSED: Right.

THE COURT: -- that you ought to be detained. They are pointing to three different grounds. They are saying one, that you will likely leave the jurisdiction of the courts if you were to be released; two, if you were to be released from custody, there is a substantial likelihood that you will commit an offence, and that that offence would be one that would harm the administration of justice or endanger the public in some way; and three, which is a broader ground, essentially, that it would be contrary to the administration of justice for you to be released as the public would lose confidence in the administration of justice if you were to be released.

And I'll go through these a little bit more right before your -- you get your opportunity, but -- so Crown counsel right now is laying the foundation for their position, and you will have an opportunity when Crown counsel is finished to address those areas that I've just mentioned, and

Submissions for Crown by Ms. Tomasson

BAN ON PUBLICATION 517(1) CCC

I'll repeat them to you and ensure that you 2 understand them. But you will have an opportunity for sure. THE ACCUSED: I -- I understand this. It's just -- I 5 don't think there's any dispute that I'm a jerk, 6 or a mean person, or I was very mean to Ms. 7 Capuano, so is this really necessary to have to go 8 through all this horrible stuff that I supposedly 9 did to her? I mean, nobody's disputing this. 10 THE COURT: Yeah. I appreciate that it's not in 11 dispute --12 THE ACCUSED: Okay. 13 THE COURT: -- but ultimately I need to make the 14 decision and I don't know any of this stuff. 15 THE ACCUSED: All right. 16 THE COURT: So it --17 THE ACCUSED: My apologies. 18 THE COURT: Yeah -- no, that's okay. So it will assist 19 me hearing these details. 20 Go ahead, Ms. Tomasson. 21 MS. TOMASSON: Thank you, Your Honour. 22 Paragraph 29 [as read in]: 23 24 The harassment was particularly insidious 25 because Mr. Fox kept Ms. Capuano in perpetual 26 fear of new ways he would devise to torment 27 her. Mr. Fox's professional expertise is in 28 information technology, and he appeared to 29 Ms. Capuano to have an alarming ability to 30 gain access to confidential information about 31 her and the people in her life. In an email 32 in January of 2017 [sic], he threatened to 33 infiltrate and expose her most personal life: 34 35 And then, further down, at the second quoted part 36 in an email (as read in): 37 38 Mr. Fox casually told Ms. Capuano that he had 39 acquired her medical records, "(unofficially 40 of course)". Then, in an email in November 41 2015, he threatened future action of several 42 types: 43 44 I was pretty direct when I told Detective 45 Tuchfarber that my intention was to do 46 everything in my power and capabilities to 47 make your life as miserable as possible, and,

44

45 46

47

Submissions for Crown by Ms. Tomasson BAN ON PUBLICATION 517(1) CCC

1 if possible, to the point that you ultimately 2 3 4 commit suicide. That would be my ultimate desire... 5 6 At paragraph 31 [as read in]: 7 In various of his emails, Mr. Fox reminded 8 Ms. Capuano that he had firearms, and the 9 ability to cross the border (into the USA) 10 surreptitiously. In one email, he detailed the logistics of bringing his firearms into 11 12 the USA and using them to kill Ms. Capuano 13 14 15 And at the end of that paragraph [as read in]: 16 17 There can be no doubt that these 18 communications were meant to intimidate 19 Ms. Capuano, despite the caveat Mr. Fox 20 always included about remaining within the 21 confines of the law. 22 23 So he would make these threats, Your Honour, but then say he wasn't serious about actually causing 24 25 her physical harm. 26 THE COURT: Was Ms. Capuano in the U.S.? 27 MS. TOMASSON: Yes. She is a -- she is an American 28 citizen and lives in the U.S. 29 At paragraph 41 the court goes in to what 30 happen in relation to the firearms offences [as 31 read inl: 32 33 Mr. Fox had a licence in Canada to acquire 34 and possess firearms, including restricted 35 firearms, as well as an authorization to 36 transport his restricted firearms to certain 37 places under certain conditions. He 38 committed the offence when he was in 39 possession of his firearms in violation of 40 the conditions, which was while the firearms 41 went from his home in Burnaby, BC to a 42 shipping depot, also in Burnaby, and while

The firearms had left Mr. Fox's home packed inside the CT unit of the computer in one of

transported them into the USA.

they stayed there with UPS picked them up and

Submissions for Crown by Ms. Tomasson

BAN ON PUBLICATION 517(1) CCC

numerous - likely 15 to 25 boxes of household items sent to a home in California of Mr. Fox's friends.

Four handguns were in the computer, and another firearm, disassembled, was in another of the boxes. A total of seven pistol magazines, as well as ammunition, were also found.

So those -- that briefly outlines the circumstances, Your Honour, of the criminal harassment and the firearms offences.

Mr. Fox, as I've said already, was sentenced to three years and 10 months with time for -- he was detained in custody on those charges, and so at the time of sentencing, the total sentence was 20-and-a-half months remaining.

He was released from custody from that sentence on December 30th of 2018, so approximately three months ago.

He -- on January 4th of 2019, he filed an application in Supreme Court to vary the terms of his probation order, in particular, the term not to leave British Columbia.

On February 6th, that application was first heard and then adjourned over to March 14th of 2019. During the February 6th application he was permitted - and you'll see it on the probation order in front of you - a variation in relation to access to the internet in relation to an ongoing appeal he has in our Court of Appeal for his conviction. He's launched a conviction appeal.

On March 14th of 2019 the application continued in relation to the terms of not leaving British Columbia, and that application was denied by Judge Holmes.

At that time, as I understand it, Mr. Fox made similar representations to the court that he was not a Canadian citizen, and that he had no status in Canada.

Judge Holmes found that, in fact, he -- the records before her, that he is a Canadian citizen, he has a Canadian passport, and that those terms remained in place for the security of the complainant who lives in the United States.

Now, Mr. Fox also has a term of his probation

Submissions for Crown by Ms. Tomasson

BAN ON PUBLICATION 517(1) CCC

in relation to the website that he set up, that he was not to disseminate any further information on that website, and in fact, he was supposed to take that website down.

That website, and another website -- I'll start with the -- the first website. That website was inactive during the time he was in custody, and has become active again since Mr. Fox has been released from custody, as well as it seems that there is another website using a shortened version of Ms. Capuano's first name that has also been launched since his release.

THE COURT: So both of these websites relate to Ms. Capuano?

MS. TOMASSON: Yes.

What is troubling as well is that it appears that Mr. Fox has also published on those websites disclosure material that would have been provided to him by the Crown for his original trial. He was under a court order from this court that when he was provided with the disclosure that he not, obviously, publish it or disseminate it as he was representing himself and the court felt that was necessary because of the undertakings that lawyers usually take -- give in relation to disclosure. As well as it appears that there are audio clips of DARS recordings from those hearings.

THE COURT: So let me --

MS. TOMASSON: That is -- --

THE COURT: -- let me repeat --

MS. TOMASSON: -- that is the active --

THE COURT: -- this back to you --

33 MS. TOMASSON: Certainly.

THE COURT: -- just so I understand. So there was the current website, what I'll call the current website, the --

MS. TOMASSON: Yes.

THE COURT: -- existing website that is referred to in the decision of --

MS. TOMASSON: Yes.

THE COURT: -- of Fox. That was inactive while Mr. Fox was in custody, but since he's been released on December 30th, so about three months ago, that is now active again?

45 MS. TOMASSON: Yes.

46 THE COURT: And a second website has been set up since he's been out --

Submissions for Crown by Ms. Tomasson

BAN ON PUBLICATION 517(1) CCC

```
MS. TOMASSON: Yes.
2
                -- that also addresses Mr. Capuano?
    THE COURT:
3
    MS. TOMASSON:
                   Yes.
    THE COURT: On one of these two there's disclosure that
5
         was received by the Crown, disclosure of the
6
         fruits of the investigation, that despite a court
7
         order in place that he not publish anything, it
8
         has been published.
9
    MS. TOMASSON:
                   Yes.
10
    THE COURT: And secondly, audio clips of court
11
         proceedings have also made it onto one of these
12
         two websites?
13
    MS. TOMASSON: That's correct.
14
    THE COURT:
                Okay.
15
    MS. TOMASSON: And that's --
16
    THE COURT:
                All right.
17
                   That's an ongoing -- that's the ongoing
    MS. TOMASSON:
18
          investigation, and as Your Honour can appreciate,
19
         that investigation involves searching out those
20
         websites, determining things, such as the IP
21
         address, where the website has been accessed from.
22
         When Mr. Fox was most recently arrested, and I'm
23
         coming up to those -- these charges before the
24
         court, he did have a tablet in his possession, as
25
         well as a cellphone, and those materials there --
26
         the police are getting a warrant for and will be
27
         looking into those to potentially link them to
28
         these websites.
                           So that's the ongoing
29
         investigation.
30
               But why that is important as well is that
31
         through the series of coming up to leaving Canada,
32
         so his application was denied on March 14th to
33
          amend that -- to permit him to leave British
34
                     So that's denied on the 14th.
         Columbia.
35
               On the 15th he made his required appointment
36
         with his probation officer, so the day after his
37
         application was denied, and the police had already
38
         contacted the probation officer about the website,
39
         because there is a term in the probation order
40
         that he's supposed to take that website down.
41
               So the probation officer had some discussions
42
         about the website and that term, and what Mr. Fox
43
         said at that time was that he couldn't do anything
44
         about it. It was run by a third party and he had
45
         no control over it.
46
               However, the material on it, Your Honour,
```

would suggest that either he put that material on

Submissions for Crown by Ms. Tomasson

BAN ON PUBLICATION 517(1) CCC

the website, or provided it to someone, but he was aware that the police were doing this investigation as the probation officer discussed it with him.

And in the Crown's submission, that also goes to the fact of why it was that he chose that day to leave Canada.

In terms of the compliance with this probation order, the only term he has been complying with, in the Crown's submission, is his reporting, and providing his residential address to his probation officer.

He was sent for a forensic assessment, and he refused to participate unless he could record the matters that they were discussing with him. That is similar to what happened when he was also sent for a psychiatric assessment during his sentencing, and he made the same demand, which, of course, was not permitted.

- THE COURT: You may be getting to this, but in terms of any additional information -- or firstly, has there been additional information put on these two websites, other than what you've already described?
- MS. TOMASSON: Yes, there has been.
- THE COURT: And is it harassing, and -- could someone characterize it as harassing?
- MS. TOMASSON: Someone could characterize it as harassing, yes, in the Crown's submission. But those -- like I said, very preliminary investigations.
- THE COURT: Yeah. Okay, thank you.
- MS. TOMASSON: So what happens on the 15th, after Mr. Fox leaves his probation office, is he took a bus to the U.S. border, he walked across the border, he was detained by the U.S. authorities, and he, at that point, sought asylum in the United States and claimed under oath again to being a U.S. citizen.

Because of his claim of asylum, Mr. Fox was detained by the U.S. authorities on March 15th as that can be a very lengthy process to try to determine what it going on, and so he was not returned to Canada until last Thursday when the U.S. authorities made their final determinations and -- and sent him back to Canada.

Once in -- and so he was returned to Canada

Submissions for Crown by Ms. Tomasson

BAN ON PUBLICATION 517(1) CCC

and turned directly over to the RCMP who had those -- the breach of probation, because he was to report March 19th, and obviously by that time he was in -- had left the -- for the States, as well as leaving British Columbia and being with 100 metres of the U.S. border.

He was interviewed on Thursday evening of last week by the police, and he could not deny what I've set out to the court in terms of leaving his probation officer's office, taking a bus and crossing the border.

In relation to -- he was asked during that interview when he decided to go to the United States, and his response was, "The moment I was sentenced." So that would have been November 10th of 2017.

He was asked about the website and made comments to the effect of, "If I don't publish it, I'm not in breach of my order. Someone else may have taken the information and published it." And he also stated that once the probation order expires, he intends on continuing with the website.

In the Crown's submission, Mr. Fox should be detained on these charges. It is apparent he has no intention on complying with the terms of probation. The website upon which these charges arose, and on which he can stop using and take down, and is one of his terms or probation to do so, appears to be active. The -- he has no intention of staying in British Columbia. He is intent on continuing to declare that he is a citizen of the United States.

In the documents that he may be referring to, that he asked the Crown to provide to him today, he's made an application to -- for social assistance. In that document he's claimed he's a U.S. citizen, and therefore social assistance was denied.

So Mr. Fox, in the Crown's submission, he's a man who currently has no work, is living in a shelter, or was before he was -- he left the province, and even upon seeking social assistance which would assist him in getting at least different accommodation and an ability to start in a rehabilitative process towards doing something other than this vendetta that he's got against his

Submissions for Crown by Ms. Tomasson

BAN ON PUBLICATION 517(1) CCC

ex-wife, he made an application, which was ultimately denied because he claimed to be a U.S. citizen and they denied his application because he provided documentation that he was a U.S. citizen, rather than providing his passport, which is that he's a Canadian citizen and he would have been entitled to these benefits. So in the Crown's submission, he does not act in his own best interest.

The -- obviously since he's already left British Columbia, the Crown is concerned that he may try to leave the country through not -- not going through a border, because he is so intent, and has been, since the decision before your court -- the Reiss decision of making these claims since 2007.

Obviously, the Crown's concerned on the secondary ground. He currently has breached three terms of his probation, and there is a serious outstanding investigation in relation to the ongoing use of the website.

And finally, in terms of the public confidence, I'm going to hand up to Your Honour a recent decision from our Court of Appeal.

THE COURT: Thanks.

MS. TOMASSON: This decision is just from last month, Your Honour, and it's dealing with bail pending appeal, and so not exactly the same situation as initial bail. But the decision that they're referring to, R. v. Oland from our -- from the Supreme Court of Canada says that the considerations under a bail pending appeal are the same considerations as Section 515(c), that -- the tertiary ground.

And why I suggest that this is a case that has some relevance is in this decision, Mr. Veeken had breached bail conditions, and the court is commenting on breach of bail and why that should be of concern to the court as it reflects on how the court's process is treated and how the court is viewed by the public.

And beginning at page 5 --

THE COURT: Yes, I'm there.

MS. TOMASSON: -- paragraph 18 [as read in]:

Conditions in the nature of Condition 6 --

Which was a bail -- breach of bail condition.

avoid circumstances in which a person may be tempted to reoffend. It is crucial for the protection of the public that they be obeyed. It must be recognized that enforcement of such conditions can be problematic because detections of breaches is difficult. To a large extent, courts must be able to place trust in an accused to comply with the conditions that they impose. For that reason, any breach of a bail condition is to be taken seriously.

-- are imposed as precautionary conditions to

And so, in the Crown's submission, those can be echoed for breach of bail -- breach of rather probation conditions. [As read in]:

Breaches raise concerns about reoffending because bail conditions are put in place to avert conditions that might lead to such conduct. Breaches also limit the ability of the public to have faith and confidence in the administration of justice. I note as well that in this case, Mr. Veeken himself brought a number of applications to amend and delete the bail conditions.

And I pause to say, as did Mr. Fox just prior to breaching these conditions:

These include an application to this court under Section 680 of the Criminal Code. In those applications, Mr. Veeken argued that the conditions were unnecessary and unlawful, but also that they were examples of ridiculous burdens placed on him by the administration of justice. Together with the breach, that indicates an attitude towards bail conditions that is not conducive to the public having confidence in the administration of justice. The conditions that were in place were not complied with in the past. The court cannot have confidence that they will be complied with in the future. In addition, of course, I have

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

THE COURT:

THE ACCUSED:

Okay.

Submissions for Crown by Ms. Tomasson

BAN ON PUBLICATION 517(1) CCC

2 lack of public confidence in compliance. And I would suggest to the court that there can be 5 no conditions put in place that this court will 6 have any confidence in, or the public would have 7 any confidence in, that Mr. Fox would comply with 8 on bail. 9 Subject to any questions Your Honour has, 10 those are my submissions. THE COURT: No, I don't have any questions. 11 12 So Mr. Fox, this is -- we're now at the point 13 where it's your opportunity to try to convince the 14 court that the Crown has not established grounds 15 for your detention. 16 We take a morning break usually around 11:00, 17 so close to now. If you like, what we can do is I 18 can give you a little primer on the law on bail, 19 and then you can consider that over the break and 20 gather your thoughts, and then when we come back 21 from the break I can hear from you. Do you want 22 to do that? 23 THE ACCUSED: No, I don't believe that that will be 24 necessary. 25 THE COURT: Okay. You understand -- you want me to 26 repeat to you what I said about these expressions 27 that you've heard, the primary ground, the 28 secondary ground and the tertiary ground so you 29 understand what those are? 30 THE ACCUSED: No. I'm -- I'm familiar with them. 31 THE COURT: Are you? 32 THE ACCUSED: Yes. 33 THE COURT: Okay, because I'm happy to repeat them for 34 you if you want. 35 THE ACCUSED: No, no, no, no.

indicated that there is -- there will be a

take a break and -THE COURT: Yeah, probably a good time. All right.
And then you can -- once again you can gather your thoughts if you like over the break and we'll come back and I'll hear from you. Then I'll hear anything in reply from Ms. Tomasson and then I will be in a position to give my decision today for sure, poss -- depending on how long the submissions are. That will determine when, in the

think that this would be an ideal time then to

I think -- I mean, if the court agrees, I

Submissions for Crown by Ms. Tomasson

```
course of the day, I'll be able to give my
2
         decision.
                   Okay?
3
    THE ACCUSED: Wonderful.
    THE COURT: All right, any questions at all? Anything
5
6
    THE ACCUSED: No.
7
    THE COURT: -- at this point? Okay. All right, we'll
8
          take the morning break.
                                   Thank you.
9
                  Thank you.
    THE ACCUSED:
10
    THE SHERI FF: Order in court, all rise.
11
12
               (PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED FOR MORNING RECESS)
13
               (PROCEEDINGS RECONVENED)
14
15
    MS. TOMASSON: Yes, Your Honour, before Mr. Fox
16
         proceeds, I just thought that since I did
17
         reference the court order that was placed -- put
18
         in place in relation to the disclosure, that I'd
19
          ask that that be marked as an exhibit so that Your
20
         Honour can see the terms of that.
21
    THE COURT:
                Sure.
22
    MS. TOMASSON: I again have a copy for an exhibit and a
23
         copy for Your Honour.
24
    THE COURT: Thank you.
25
    MS. TOMASSON: I'll provide a copy to Mr. Fox.
26
    THE ACCUSED: This would be Exhibit 3, I believe.
27
    MS. TOMASSON: Exhibit 5.
28
    THE CLERK: Exhibit 5.
29
    THE ACCUSED: 5, oh. Oh, yeah.
30
31
               EXHIBIT 5: Photocopy of Order, Court File
32
               244069 Vancouver Provincial Court Registry,
33
               Her Majesty the Queen v. Patrick Fox, Before
34
               the Honourable Justice Burgess on Friday, the
35
               7th day of October, 2016
36
37
    THE COURT: Okay, thank you.
38
              Mr. Fox, let me hear from you.
39
40
    SUBMISSIONS BY THE ACCUSED:
41
42
    THE ACCUSED: Okay. The first issue -- and I think it
43
          is probably the most significant issue, is this
44
         question of my citizenship and whether or not I
45
         have status.
46
               The reason I think that this is critical,
47
          even for the purposes of the bail hearing, is that
```

Submissions by the Accused

BAN ON PUBLICATION 517(1) CCC

if I am a Canadian citizen, then I clearly acted in bad faith by leaving Canada and most likely to evade the probation conditions or whatever other reason.

However, if I'm not a Canadian citizen, then that means that I have no status in Canada, no social insurance number, can't get social assistance, etc., and the probation conditions essentially force me to be homeless and destitute for the full three-year period, as well as also forcing me to perpetually be in violation of the Immigration laws by remaining in Canada.

Now, it's my understanding, and I'm sure this isn't going to be disputed, but a court cannot impose a probation condition on a person which would necessarily force them to break the law. I remember reading that in case law somewhere, but I can't remember which right now.

So, the only agency in North America, in either Canada or the United States, that has the power to declare that a person is or is not a Canadian citizen is Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, or IRCC. And this document that I have here that the Crown printed for me clearly states that — that I was born in the United States of America, citizenship is unknown and my last country of permanent residence is unknown.

THE COURT: Do you want -- do you want me to look at that document?

THE ACCUSED: Yes, please.

THE COURT: Sure.

33 THE ACCUSED: How shall I --

THE COURT: Do you have a -- you can give it to Madam Clerk.

THE ACCUSED: Thank you, and here's a copy for you.

Now --

THE COURT: Just give me one sec.

THE ACCUSED: Sure.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE ACCUSED: I would like to point out that on the last page of this, there's something called a non-computer-based entry, and these are just case notes that IRCC uses in their field operation support system. There's a remarks section at the bottom here, and the Crown has brought up a number of times that what they're saying there is that

Submissions by the Accused

```
IRCC has determined that I was that person from
2
          Sudbury, Ontario, but that's not at all what
3
         they're claiming in here.
               What they're saying is that a passport was
5
         issued in that name, and based on the existence of
6
         that passport, there is a person named Ricky Reiss
7
         who was born in Sudbury, Ontario. Based on that
8
         they issued a 10-year authorization for me to
9
         enter and remain in Canada. That expired, as you
10
         can see, on -- in May of 2018.
               So at this point, I have absolutely no
11
12
          authorization to remain in Canada, based on what
13
          IRCC is saying in here.
14
    THE COURT: Sorry. I just want to make sure I
15
         understand --
16
    THE ACCUSED: Sure.
17
    THE COURT: -- because this is an important part of
18
          your argument.
19
               So the Immigration, Refugee and Citizenship
20
         Canada issued you this letter dated March 27th,
21
         2018, in response to a request under the Privacy
22
         Act that you made?
23
    THE ACCUSED: Yes, yes.
24
    THE COURT:
                That request was made in order to get some
25
          sort of documentary form of evidence to establish
26
          that you are actually a U.S. citizen?
27
    THE ACCUSED: No, no. Not to get evidence that I'm a
28
         U.S. citizen. The request -- well, the request
29
         was just for all records --
30
    THE COURT: Yeah.
31
    THE ACCUSED: -- relating to myself, either as Patrick
32
          Fox or as Richard Reiss.
33
    THE COURT:
                Okay. Your citizenship --
34
    THE ACCUSED: Right, right.
35
    THE COURT:
                -- we'll say. Okay.
36
    THE ACCUSED: And I wasn't trying --
37
    THE COURT: So then it --
38
    THE ACCUSED: -- to lead them one way or the other.
39
    THE COURT: So that comes back that Richard Reiss --
40
         Reiss -- says citizenship, unknown, country of
41
         birth, United States, CLPR unknown, gender, male.
42
         And so you're pointing to that to say that that's
43
         proof that you are a U.S. citizen?
44
    THE ACCUSED: Well, for the purposes of this
45
         proceeding, and for the purposes of probation,
46
          it's not a question of whether or not I'm a U.S.
47
         citizen, it's only a question of whether or not
```

Submissions by the Accused

```
I'm a Canadian citizen. Now, which country --
2
    THE COURT: Okay.
3
    THE ACCUSED: -- I am a citizen of is completely
         irrelevant. It's only relevant whether or not I'm
4
5
         a Canadian citizen.
6
    THE COURT: Okay, so does this say you're not a
7
         Canadian citizen anywhere?
8
    THE ACCUSED: Well, no, it doesn't explicitly state I'm
9
         not a Canadian citizen. However, if a person is
10
         born outside of Canada, then they would need to
         apply for a Certificate of Citizenship. The fact
11
12
         that I've -- there's no record of me ever doing so
13
         would mean the implication would be that I have no
14
         status in Canada.
15
    THE COURT: Well, what do I do -- and I'm -- I'm asking
16
         you this just -- again, these are -- these are
         inquiries, just so I --
17
18
    THE ACCUSED: Yeah.
19
    THE COURT: -- understand this, because this is an
20
         important part of your argument. Firstly, what is
21
         FOSS, F-O-S-S?
22
    THE ACCUSED:
                  That stands for Field Operation Support
23
         System.
24
    THE COURT: Okay. UCI, what is that?
25
    THE ACCUSED: That's Unique Client Identifier.
26
27
    THE COURT: Okay.
28
    THE ACCUSED: -- number that uniquely identifies each
29
         person in IRCC's system, and that's actually going
30
         to be relevant when we get to this social
31
         assistance document here.
32
    THE COURT: Okay. It says, citizenship unknown,
33
         country of birth, United States of America.
34
         is CLPR?
35
    THE ACCUSED: Country of Last Permanent Residence.
36
    THE COURT: Once again, unknown. Okay. So then we
37
         flip the page. Nothing there.
38
              And then, we get to the last page, non-
39
         computer-based entry. Richard Reiss. The same
40
         UCI, and it says, Canadian citizen, that this was
41
         created May 21st, 2008, expiry 2018, so a 10-year
         period. Remarks, NCB, what's that?
42
43
    THE ACCUSED: NCB is non-computer-based.
44
    THE COURT: Created for NCMS. What's NCMS?
45
    THE ACCUSED:
                  I can't recall what that acronym stands
46
         for, sorry.
47
    THE COURT: All right. Created for some form of entry.
```

Submissions by the Accused

```
1
         Received info that
                                   I'll say Reiss, was detained
2
         by U.S. Department of Homeland Security --
3
    THE ACCUSED: Yes.
4
    THE COURT: -- and claiming to be born in U.S. but had
5
         Canadian passport showing born in Canada. But how
6
         do Canadian -- did you have a Canadian -- does --
7
    THE ACCUSED: Um --
8
                -- does this refer to an incident that you
    THE COURT:
9
         personally were in --
10
    THE ACCUSED: In the --
11
    THE COURT:
                -- involved in?
12
    THE ACCUSED: In the 1990s I did apply for, based on
13
         false pretences, a Canadian passport. A passport
14
         was issued. IRCC later determined that I was not
15
         the person named on the passport. And I have
16
         further evidence from IRCC as well, recordings of
17
         conversations with them, which are publicly
18
         accessible on the website as well, where we talk
19
         about the issuance of that passport and such.
20
    THE COURT: So the Canadian -- but he had a Canadian
21
         passport, showing born in Canada, was able to
22
         conclude that he was, in fact, born in Sudbury,
23
         Ontario, and passport was legitimately issued?
24
    THE ACCUSED: Yes.
25
    THE COURT: Okay. So that doesn't quite square up with
26
         what you just said, which was the passport was --
27
         was fraudulently obtained --
28
    THE ACCUSED: Right.
29
    THE COURT: -- and that that fraud was ultimately
30
         detected and the passport was taken?
31
    THE ACCUSED: Um -- well, the passport was eventually
32
         lost.
33
    THE COURT:
                Okay.
34
    THE ACCUSED: This is -- this is going back 22, 23
35
36
              At the time that this remark was made in the
37
         FOSS system, back in 2008, it hadn't been
38
         determined at that point that the passport was
39
         fraudulently issued. It was -- what are we, in
40
         2019 -- 2018 or 2019 is when IRCC determined that
41
         it was inappropriately issued.
42
    THE COURT: Fraudulently issued. Let's call a spade a
43
         spade.
44
    THE ACCUSED:
                  Okay.
    THE COURT: Okay.
45
46
    THE ACCUSED: Oh, also though, I want to point out that
47
         the non-computer-based entry here -- these are
```

Submissions by the Accused

BAN ON PUBLICATION 517(1) CCC

just remarks, that's not an official record. The 2 official record is what's printed on the -- the 3 third page where it says, country of birth, United States. Now, if they had actually determined that I was born in Canada, then I would have to believe 5 6 that they would have updated the country of birth 7 in the official record. 8 THE COURT: Okay. So, you've handed that up and I --9 and obviously we've gone though it in some detail. 10 All right, what's next? 11 THE ACCUSED: May I ask that that be admitted as an 12 exhibit? 13 THE COURT: Yeah, we can do that. Any objection? MS. TOMASSON: No, Your Honour. Do you want to keep 14 15 your copy and I'll hand up this as an --16 THE COURT: Yeah, I do --17 MS. TOMASSON: -- exhibit. THE COURT: -- want to keep my copy. 18 Thank you. So 19 that will be Exhibit 7, I believe. 20 THE CLERK: Exhibit 6, Your Honour. 21 THE COURT: Exhibit 6. Was the -- the order that we 22 just marked, that was Exhibit 5? 23 THE CLERK: That's correct, Your Honour. 24 THE COURT: Thank you. 25 26 EXHIBIT 6: Photocopy of Immigration, 27 Refugees and Citizenship Canada Access to 28 Information and Privacy Division, letter 29 dated March 27, 2018, "All Records concerning 30 REISS, Richard AKA FOX, Patrick Henry" 31 32 THE ACCUSED: So the Crown asserts that I was the 33 person born Ricky Reiss or Richard Reiss in 34 Sudbury, Ontario, but to date, the Crown has 35 produced absolutely no direct or physical evidence 36 to support that whatsoever. 37 And in fact, Mr. Myhre, the Crown at the 38 trial, submitted as Exhibit 1, a copy of my 39 Florida birth certificate, which I would say 40 clearly refutes their claim that I was born in 41 Sudbury, Ontario. Unfortunately, I don't have a 42 copy of that on hand, but it is in the court's 43 records. 44 And earlier the Crown also made numerous 45 references to what she was referring to as my 46 Canadian passport. However, I'd like to point out

that there is no such Canadian passport. Many

Submissions by the Accused

BAN ON PUBLICATION 517(1) CCC

years ago a passport was issued. It was lost many, many years ago back in the 90s, and there is no actual passport at this point, whether it's Canadian or American.

Oh, another -- another very significant issue or point on this issue of my citizenship is Mr. Myhre had sent me an email back in, I think it was February, where he had forwarded an email conversation that he had had with Steve Reiss, who is Ricky Reiss' -- Ricky Reiss being the person from Sudbury, Ontario, who admittedly I had assumed his identity back in the early 90s and lived under that name for many years. But Mr. Myhre had had a conversation with Steve Reiss, and Steve Reiss had offered to provide a DNA sample to prove whether or not he is my father.

As soon as Mr. Myhre informed me about that I told him, that's excellent, I would love to proceed with that, because I really want to clear up this issue about whether or not I'm that person. Mr. Myhre immediately then backed down from that and said, oh, we're not going to proceed with that because we have this other evidence. He said that unless the court ordered him to, he was not going to pursue that.

So at the March 14th hearing, I had asked the court to order the Crown to request DNA samples from Steve Reiss and from a Peggy Sampuno [phonetic] who is Ricky Reiss' mother. The court immediately denied that request, said that's not going to happen, it's not relevant to these matters, which strikes me as very peculiar because it seems that my citizenship is very relevant to these conditions that we're talking about now, about leaving Canada.

Now, certainly, moving forward, not with the bail hearing, but certainly moving forward with the probation violation hearings, obviously I'm going to formally pursue those DNA tests because that will certainly help to prove whether or not I am Ricky Reiss from Ontario.

THE COURT: All right. Well, I got to ask you, why did you assume Ricky Reiss' identity in the 90s?

THE ACCUSED: I ran away from home very young and my parents kept finding me. I wanted to be able to move on with my life without my parents or family being able to find me, so I changed my name to

Submissions by the Accused

BAN ON PUBLICATION 517(1) CCC

Richard Reiss.

Now, under California law, there's two ways you can change your name. There's the formal, where you go to court and request it, and then there's what's called a common law name change where you just assume a name. So in, I think it was '92, maybe '93, I had assumed the name Richard Reiss. I chose that name because I knew that there was a person with that name with the same date of birth.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE ACCUSED: And the reason I chose a foreign national is because if I had assumed the name of another U.S. citizen, eventually there would be some overlap in tax information and eventually you would get caught. If you change your name to match that of a foreign national, obviously there's not going to be any kind of duplicate.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE ACCUSED: And I do admit that it was wrong to have done so, but it was -- it was a long time ago.

THE COURT: I have one other question before you leave the topic of citizenship.

THE ACCUSED: Sure.

THE COURT: So let me know when you're transitioning to your next topic.

THE ACCUSED: Okay. I think that the DNA issue that I just discussed, I think that was the last thing I was going to mention on that, but let me just doublecheck my notes.

Oh, okay. I guess the one last thing that I do want to point out, how the citizenship issue relates to the probation conditions. If I'm not a Canadian citizen, but I'm not allowed to leave British Columbia -- well, no, I think I already covered that essentially, about the being homeless and having no way to support myself.

Okay. I would say then, if that is the case, then my decision to leave -- well, to leave Canada, not just British Columbia, was not so that I could evade the probation conditions. It would have been purely out of necessity, since remaining here, I can't possibly support myself, I can't get healthcare, I can't get social assistance or anything else.

And so, the reason I waited until after the March 14th hearing is I was hoping that the court

```
would remove that restriction, and then I would be
2
         able to leave legally without violating the
3
         probation condition.
              The court didn't, and then it seemed to me at
5
         that point either I look forward to spending the
6
         next two years and nine months moving from
7
         homeless shelter to homeless shelter, wondering
8
         whether or not I'll be able to eat tomorrow, or
9
         take my chances and go back to the U.S.
10
    THE COURT: Did these arguments that you're making
         before me today, were those ones that you made in
11
12
         front of Madam Justice Holmes in March?
13
    THE ACCUSED: Oh, yes. Also --
14
    THE COURT: So this is a -- this is sort of a repeat of
15
         what you placed in front of her?
16
    THE ACCUSED: Yes.
                        Yes.
17
    THE COURT: Okay.
18
    THE ACCUSED:
                  I mean I didn't --
19
    THE COURT: Okay.
20
    THE ACCUSED: -- discuss them at such length at this
21
         because she was already familiar with the issues.
22
              In the -- oh, yes. In the sentencing order,
23
         Exhibit 3, that was provided to you earlier --
24
    THE COURT: Mm-hmm.
25
    THE ACCUSED: -- you will notice in paragraph 120, at
         the time of sentencing I brought this issue up to
26
27
         Justice Holmes, the fact that I'm not a Canadian
28
         citizen and I have no status, and that imposing
29
         these conditions is going to put me in a position
30
         where the moment I'm released from custody I'm
31
         immediately in violation of the immigration laws.
32
    THE COURT: Sorry, what paragraph?
33
    THE ACCUSED: Oh, 120, I'm sorry.
34
    THE COURT:
                Okay.
35
    THE ACCUSED: And so, it puts me in a position where I
36
         have to choose between violating the immigration
37
         laws or violating probation. But either way, I'm
38
         breaking one or the other. And the issue was not
39
         addressed at that point. It was decided it we be
40
         addressed after the incarceration was completed
41
         and the probation started.
42
    THE COURT: Let me ask you this.
43
    THE ACCUSED: Yes.
44
                This -- firstly, who's Movant?
    THE COURT:
45
    THE ACCUSED:
                  I'm sorry?
46
    THE COURT: Movant? Does that --
47
    THE ACCUSED: Is it --
```

```
MS. TOMASSON: Oh, that's just a reference in court in
          the States in terms of defendant.
2
3
    THE COURT: Movant is --
    THE ACCUSED: Oh --
5
    THE COURT: -- the term -- okay, that's -- you learn
6
          something each day.
7
    THE ACCUSED: I believe it's --
8
    THE COURT: Yeah.
9
    THE ACCUSED: -- Movant. The party which is --
10
    THE COURT: Movant.
11
    MS. TOMASSON: If you look --
12
    THE ACCUSED: -- somebody in the motion --
13
    MS. TOMASSON: -- on the bottom of the --
14
    THE COURT: Yeah. No, I see Defendant/Movant.
15
          -- I hadn't seen that expression in my 30 years of
16
         law.
               Okay.
17
               Anyway, let's go back to that for a second.
18
         So, one of the convictions that you sustained was
19
          false claim of citizenship.
20
    THE ACCUSED: Indeed. And every time that I --
21
                This was a claim of U.S. citizenship.
    THE COURT:
22
    THE ACCUSED: In the Immigration Court I clearly stated
23
         that I am a United States citizen by virtue of
24
         being born in the United States.
25
               On May 5th, 2018, the Immigration judge told
26
         Homeland Security that unless they have some proof
         that I'm an alien he's going to dismiss the case
27
28
         at the next hearing. That same day, my
29
         deportation officer, who works for ICE, contacted
30
         the Toronto Police because Ricky Reiss had been
31
          arrested, I think it was 1991 or '92 in Toronto.
32
               The Toronto Police sent the mugshot and the
33
          fingerprints of that person of Ricky Reiss to ICE.
34
          ICE saw that it clearly was not me, so then they
35
         charged me with perjury and false claim of U.S.
36
         citizenship, otherwise the case would have been
37
          dismissed at the next hearing.
38
               Um --
39
    THE COURT:
                Okay.
40
    THE ACCUSED: -- I fought that case, had a court-
41
          appointed lawyer. He did absolutely nothing.
42
         was found quilty.
43
               And then the Immigration Court later issued
44
         an order of removal, based solely on that
45
         conviction, not on any evidence that I was
46
         actually not a U.S. citizen.
47
               Now, the many times that I've gone back to
```

```
the U.S. since then, sometimes Homeland Security
2
         pulls me aside, they send me to secondary, they do
3
         further investigation. Initially they'll say, oh,
         we're charging you with illegal re-entry, false
5
         claim of U.S. citizenship etc. etc. They do the
6
         investigation, they drop all the charges and then
7
         they either let me go or they try to coordinate
8
         with the RCMP that I be sent back here.
9
              The two most recent times, in June 2016, and
10
         then just last week, what they did was they
         coordinated with the RCMP to make me, as they
11
12
         called it, a subject of interest, so that the RCMP
13
         would request that I be sent back here.
14
    THE COURT:
                All right. Okay, so we've dealt with the
15
         citizenship issue.
16
    THE ACCUSED: The --
17
    THE COURT: No?
18
    THE ACCUSED: -- citizenship issue, yes, but I would
19
         like to respond to some points that the Crown had
20
         made earlier with respect to the social assistance
21
         application.
22
    THE COURT:
                Sure.
23
    THE ACCUSED: And that also relates to the citizenship
24
         issue --
25
    THE COURT: Okay.
26
    THE ACCUSED: -- and whether or not my remaining in
27
         Canada is going to cause me any kind of
28
         substantial hardship. May I --
29
    THE COURT: Yeah.
30
    THE ACCUSED: It's -- the important information is
31
         really just on the first --
32
    THE COURT: Yeah, no --
33
    THE ACCUSED: -- page.
34
    THE COURT:
                -- I'm -- I'm happy --
35
    THE ACCUSED: The rest is not --
36
    THE COURT:
               -- happy to receive it.
37
    THE ACCUSED:
                  Now --
38
    THE COURT: Okay.
39
    THE ACCUSED: -- as the Crown had presented it earlier,
40
         they presented it as I had told Social Assistance
41
         that I'm a United States citizen and that my
42
         application was denied based on that. There's
43
         actually a little bit more to it as you'll see in
44
         here.
45
              Social Assistance contacted IRCC and gave
46
         them the information that I had provided. Now, I
47
         had provided Social Assistance both the names,
```

Submissions by the Accused

BAN ON PUBLICATION 517(1) CCC

Patrick Fox and Richard Reiss, as well as that UCI number that you had seen in the IRCC document.

IRCC then investigated and they responded to Social Assistance one, two -- the third paragraph in here it says [as read in]:

IRCC stated with the information provided we have searched our records and found no indication that this person has been granted or issued a Certificate of Citizenship or Naturalization.

So it wasn't based just on me telling Social Assistance that I'm not a Canadian citizen.

And then, in the last paragraph, right above where it says "attachments" Social Assistance writes:

No information has been submitted to indicate you meet any of the criteria above. You are not a Canadian citizen, an authorized permanent resident, or a convention refugee. You are not in Canada on a temporary resident permit.

Etc., etc.

So, based on that it's quite clear that I'm not going to be eligible for Social Assistance, but not because I told them that I'm not a Canadian citizen, it's because they contacted IRCC, verified the information I provided them, and IRCC said that, no, there is no Certificate of Citizenship, which would include a birth certificate, for this person. There is nothing to indicate that I had any status in Canada whatsoever.

That again puts me then in a position where I'm not allowed to leave Canada, but I'm not allowed to support myself. I can't get Social Assistance, I can't get medical care or MSP it's called up here.

IRCC is not going to issue me any kind of temporary status or a permanent resident status, first of all because I'm inadmissible due to this criminal conviction. And second, because obviously the conviction from the United States, the perjury conviction, both make me inadmissible

```
to Canada.
2
               So again, it puts me in a situation where I
3
         have to decide, do I violate probation, or do I
          stay here and starve to death on the streets of
5
         Vancouver while at the same time breaking the
          Immigration laws.
7
               And that's all I would have to say about the
8
          citizenship issue.
9
               I would request that this document -- and I
10
          don't know that we need to attach the entire
         document, but really it's just the first two pages
11
          are the important part. I would request that that
12
13
         be admitted as an exhibit.
14
                Ms. Tomasson, any objection to just the
    THE COURT:
15
          first two pages being admitted?
16
    MS. TOMASSON: I think the -- the rest of it is the
17
          actual initial application, so --
18
    THE ACCUSED: Oh --
19
    MS. TOMASSON: -- I think the whole document should go
20
          in, Your Honour --
21
    THE COURT:
                Sure.
22
    MS. TOMASSON: -- because the first two pages refer to
23
         what was --
24
    THE ACCUSED:
                   Sure.
25
    THE COURT: Shall -- shall we do that, Mr. Fox?
26
    THE ACCUSED: Yeah, I have no objection.
27
    THE COURT: We'll just mark the whole thing. Sure.
28
    MS. TOMASSON: And again, I'll hand Madam Clerk a copy.
29
    THE COURT: That's Exhibit 7.
30
31
               EXHIBIT 7:
                                Photocopy of British Columbia
32
               Ministry of Social Development and Poverty
33
               Reduction Employment and Assistance Request
34
               for Reconsideration, Requestor's Name Patrick
35
               Fox
36
37
    THE ACCUSED: And I do have documents here from CBSA as
38
         well, but they're essentially the same documents
39
          that IRCC provided, showing that I was born in the
40
         United States and that I have no status in Canada,
41
          so I don't -- I don't think that that would really
         be necessary.
42
                        It would be redundant.
43
                Anything else?
    THE COURT:
44
    THE ACCUSED: Now, I would -- oh, okay, I already told
45
          about the Florida birth certificate.
46
               I would like to point out, at the hearing on
47
          the 14th, I told Justice Holmes that in my
```

Submissions by the Accused

BAN ON PUBLICATION 517(1) CCC

conversations with CBSA, CBSA had stated to me that while they're not going to come after me, due to my lack of status in Canada, if I turn myself in to one of their offices, or any point of entry, that they will either remove me or deny me entry into Canada.

So, I had informed Justice Holmes about that at that hearing, and I told her that regardless of what the court decided about removing that condition or not, within the next week I would intend to turn myself into CBSA, which would result in me being removed from -- from Canada.

And in fact, on the 15th, when I went to Peace Arch Park, I did turn myself in to CBSA, and I checked with CBSA first to make sure that their office was not within 100 metres of the U.S. border, and they assured me that no, it's closer to 300 or so metres from the border. And then it was only after I turned myself in to CBSA that I then proceeded over to turn myself into CBP on the U.S. side.

So I was not trying to sneak around, I was not trying to flee or escape anything. I was very clear with the court, with CBSA, even with the probation officer that morning. I told him that within --

THE COURT: So

THE ACCUSED: Sorry, go ahead.

THE COURT: No, go ahead, go ahead.

THE ACCUSED: When I reported for probation on the morning of the 15th, I told the probation officer that by Wednesday at the absolute latest, Wednesday of the coming week, I have every intention of turning myself into CBSA resulting in my removal from Canada.

The probation officer did inform me that he had heard that the RCMP was investigating something about a copy of the website being on line, but I would think that that would have absolutely nothing to do with my decision to -- to leave Canada. My decision to leave Canada had a lot more to do with being able to feed myself and support myself and get back to my career as a software engineer rather than living in homeless shelters.

I believe one of the conditions that I'm charged with violating right now has something to

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45 46

47

Submissions by the Accused

BAN ON PUBLICATION 517(1) CCC

do with failing to report on March 19th? THE COURT: Yeah, that's -- that's correct. THE ACCUSED: My response to that would be I was in Homeland Security custody and had absolutely no way to report. It could be argued that me being in Homeland Security custody was the result of my own actions, but regardless of how I came to be in Homeland Security custody on March 19th, I was, and therefore was physically incapable of reporting. So again, there was no bad faith, I believe, on my part. Now, the Crown had mentioned -- the Crown had made reference earlier to a copy of the website going offline while I was in custody and then coming back on line when I was released - a copy of the original website, not the -- the new version of it. That's actually incorrect. That copy that she's referring to was generated by an organization called the Internet Archive, a nonprofit organization in the United States based in San Francisco. That has been online since I believe it was June 2016. That has absolutely nothing to do with me. I have no influence over the Internet Archive, and what they choose to archive, that's -- that's their business. But that has not been offline at all since June 2016. THE COURT: Sorry, is this the -- what I'll call website number 1 --THE ACCUSED: Uh --THE COURT: -- that's been referred to as website -that has not been offline? THE ACCUSED: That is correct, yes, because -- well, okay, there's the original website, which was with the hosting provider that I was hosting, that went offline in January 2018 because the hosting plan wasn't renewed. But there was a copy of that that was made by the Internet Archive. What the Crown was saying went online after I was released in December, the Crown, I believe, is referring to that cached copy. That cached copy is what hasn't been offline. That's been there the whole time.

THE COURT: So the cached copy remains online?
THE ACCUSED: Right. But as I say, that has absolutely nothing to do with me. That's a non-profit organization in San Francisco, and I have no

```
control over what they decide to cache.
2
               With respect to the disclosure material that
3
          found its way onto the new website, in the order
         which was provided there is an exemption for any
5
         material that is received from other sources, and
6
         what is on the website, on the new website, is --
7
         was not received from Crown as disclosure
8
         material. It was received from other sources.
9
    THE COURT: Well, what is it? Is it Reports to Crown
10
          Counsel, police --
11
    THE ACCUSED: Yes, all the RTCCs --
12
    THE COURT: So, what other sources, or do you know?
13
    THE ACCUSED: I cannot answer that at this time.
14
    THE COURT: Is that because you don't want to answer
15
          it, or you can't? And -- and I'm not --
16
    THE ACCUSED: It's --
17
    THE COURT: -- look at, I won't force you, but just --
18
    THE ACCUSED:
                   I'll -- I'll be honest, it's because I
19
          don't want to because I don't want to -- I don't
20
         want to say who in either the RCMP, or the Crown
21
          or the Ministry of Justice would have assisted me
22
          in obtaining that material.
23
               But I can tell you that some of the material
24
         that is on the website, the Crown never provided,
25
          such as the audio recordings of the interview with
26
         the RCMP and Capuano where she's laughing and
27
         joking with them.
28
               So the fact that that is on the website,
29
         pretty clearly shows that it wasn't material that
         was received from -- from the Crown because they
30
31
          never provided me that.
32
     THE COURT: Sorry, they never provided you with the
          audio of the interviews with the complainant?
33
34
    THE ACCUSED: Of that one particular interview where
35
          the complainant was laughing and joking with the
36
         RCMP --
37
    THE COURT: Okay.
38
     THE ACCUSED: -- about the same stuff she was crying
39
          about.
40
    THE COURT: Okay.
41
     THE ACCUSED: So again, I don't think that there was
42
          any -- like I didn't violate any order by doing
43
          anything with the material, because it wasn't
44
         material that was covered by this order.
45
         received from other sources.
46
               With respect to the police having my tablet
47
          and my phone, hoping to find some incriminating
```

```
evidence on there, they don't need a warrant for
 2
                I will happily give them access to those
3
         devices.
4
    THE COURT: Hang on one sec.
5
    THE ACCUSED: Sure.
6
    THE COURT: So if I understand what you're saying about
7
         website 2, you're -- are you -- I have to tread
8
          lightly because this is where if you had counsel
9
          it would be helpful.
10
    THE ACCUSED: Mmm.
11
    THE COURT: Let me just ask you this. Your defence to
12
         not having violated the order of Justice Burgess
13
         that disclosure must not be broadcast, disclosure
14
          received from Crown, you're saying it wasn't
15
         received from Crown?
16
    THE ACCUSED: I'm saying it wasn't received from Crown
17
          as part of the disclosure --
18
    THE COURT: Disclosure.
19
    THE ACCUSED: -- in the case.
20
    THE COURT: But you're not denying at this point that
21
         you had something to do with it being on the
22
         website and broadcast?
23
    THE ACCUSED: I fully admit that all of the content on
24
         the new website was created by me. I don't admit,
25
         however, that I published that.
26
    THE COURT: This is where --
27
    THE ACCUSED: So for -- for example --
28
    THE COURT:
                This -- you --
29
    THE ACCUSED:
                   I -- I --
                -- know, I appreciate --
30
    THE COURT:
31
    THE ACCUSED: Okay.
32
    THE COURT: -- your honesty. Do you want -- do you --
33
    THE ACCUSED: The probation --
34
    THE COURT:
                This is where things get sticky --
35
    THE ACCUSED: Right.
36
    THE COURT:
                -- because there's an investigation going
37
          on right now and what --
38
    THE ACCUSED: And I'll full cooperate with that
39
          investigation.
40
    THE COURT: Well, you may have just advanced the
41
          investigation with your last answer, but --
42
    THE ACCUSED: Well, the probation condition prohibits
43
         me from publishing, disseminating or distributing
44
         the information. There's nothing in the probation
45
         conditions that prohibit me from continuing to
46
         create or maintain a version of the website on my
47
         own computer, as long as I don't publish,
```

```
disseminate or distribute that information.
2
              And even still --
3
    THE COURT:
                You know --
4
    THE ACCUSED: -- even if I were to admit that, I would
5
         love, like I said earlier, to have another trial
6
         for criminal harassment because the mistakes that
7
         were made at the first trial and all the
8
         collusion, would definitely not happen a second
9
         time.
10
    THE COURT: See, one -- one of the things I need to
         decide, as I mentioned to you, is, is there a
11
12
         substantial likelihood of you committing an
13
         offence if you were to be released --
14
    THE ACCUSED: Right.
15
                -- from custody and -- and with respect to
    THE COURT:
16
         the harm that may cause. So it's in that vein
17
         that I ask the next question. Why? Why have
         website number 2? Why put this stuff on there?
18
19
    THE ACCUSED: I can tell you that. In fact, I made a
20
         note on this paper to make sure that I didn't
21
         forget to mention this --
22
    THE COURT: Okay, good, I'm glad --
23
    THE ACCUSED: -- because people keep --
24
    THE COURT: -- I've assisted you.
25
                  -- asking me why, and why don't I just
    THE ACCUSED:
26
         put it behind me and move on.
27
    THE COURT: I'm not --
28
    THE ACCUSED: She took my child away.
                                            She took steps
29
         to get me deported from the country so she could
30
         get custody of our child, a child she abandoned, a
31
         child I raised by myself. And then, once I was
32
         deported, I lost custody, and then she did
33
         everything she could to make it impossible for me
34
         to keep any kind of contact with him. I have not
35
         had any contact with my son since May 26th of
36
         2016. And for that reason, I will never forgive
37
         her, and I will never stop.
38
              And when the probation is finished in three
39
         years, and I return to the United States or
40
         wherever I go, everything will continue.
41
              Now, I'd also like to point out though, the
42
         second website is online right now, has a huge
43
         amount of incriminating evidence and proof that
44
         she committed so much perjury and proof of all
45
         this collusion between Lagemaat and Myhre, whether
46
         I am in jail, whether I am denied bail, or I am
47
         released, isn't going to change that. It's
```

```
already there, it's on the internet, and ...
2
     THE COURT:
                Hang on one second, Mr. Fox. I just want
 3
          to gather my thoughts for a moment.
    THE ACCUSED: Sure.
                          Should I sit, or --
5
    THE COURT: You can -- you can --
6
    THE ACCUSED: Sure.
7
     THE COURT: -- remain standing. I'm just -- I'm just
8
         making notes. I just want to jot down a thought
9
         here, hold on.
10
     THE ACCUSED: May -- may I point out one more thing
          though about the website, or make one declaration
11
12
          about it, and this even was proven somewhat at the
13
          trial. Every single word on the website is true.
          There is absolutely no defamation; there are no
14
15
          false statements against Capuano. The Crown never
16
          even attempted to claim that any of the statements
17
         were false during the trial.
18
     THE COURT: So would I be accurate -- actually, never
19
         mind, never mind.
20
     THE ACCUSED: Oh. Well, you can ask.
21
     THE COURT:
                That's -- that's okay.
                                        No, I think -- I
22
          think you've a nswered the question I was going to
23
          ask.
24 THE ACCUSED: The Crown also stated earlier that Ms.
25
          Capuano had taken numerous steps to get the
26
          website taken down and that was also an issue that
27
          came up during the trial and the sentencing.
28
               But every effort that Ms. Capuano ever took
29
          to get the website taken down was very sideways,
30
          it was very collateral. There were things that
31
          she could have done that could have gotten the
32
         website taken down very easily. Once I was in
33
          custody, she could have filed a complaint with the
34
         hosting provider.
35
               She always did things that would be enough to
36
         make it look like she was doing something, but not
37
          enough to actually get it taken down. For
38
          example, she would file a complaint, but with the
39
          wrong service provider. And then when it was
40
         brought to her attention, she wouldn't refile the
41
          complaint with the -- with the correct one.
42
               So I personally don't believe that Ms.
43
          Capuano has any interest in having the website
44
          taken down, because I believe that she prefers the
45
          attention that she gets with the website being up.
46
               Oh, there was -- oh, where'd it go? The
47
          Crown had mentioned earlier also that when I was
```

Submissions by the Accused

BAN ON PUBLICATION 517(1) CCC

speaking with the RCMP last week, they had asked me when I decided to return to the United States and the Crown had said that I said that as soon as I was sentenced.

There was more to my response than that though. What I had told the RCMP, and of course it's all in video and the audio, so it's all provable, was that even -- well, certainly at the point of the sentencing I knew that I was going to be returning to the United States, but even before that, but my original intention was that I was going to return to the United States as soon as the probation conditions were vacated.

Now, I assumed the appeal would proceed and the probation would be vacated once the appeal was granted.

When I began to realize that the appeal wasn't going to proceed because [indiscernible] and the LSS applications were denied, and I don't have \$2,000 for the transcripts, I then began to realize that I'm probably going to be stuck here for three years and my intention at that point was that, yes, I'm going to return to the United States once the probation is finished, and that's clearly in the RCMP interview.

So it's not that I was -- I didn't tell the RCMP that I was intending to return to the United States immediately, because that would violate the probation.

THE COURT: But then, when you didn't get your way in front of Justice Holmes, that's when you decided you were going to head to the States.

THE ACCUSED: Well, I wouldn't phrase is as when I didn't get my way; I would phrase it as --

THE COURT: I don't mean that in a derogatory way.

THE ACCUSED: Okay.

THE COURT: I mean, I'm just speaking in plain language.

THE ACCUSED: Right. I see it -- I saw it then, and I still see it now, as purely a matter of necessity.

Just as I had said earlier --

THE COURT: Yeah, I --

THE ACCUSED: -- what is the point in releasing me?
You might as well just keep me in jail until the probation is done.

THE COURT: Right. Okay, I've got that argument.

THE ACCUSED: And, I guess that's it. Those are my

```
submissions.
2
    THE COURT: Ms. Tomasson, anything in reply?
3
    MS. TOMASSON: No, thank you, Your Honour.
    THE COURT: Did you -- who was -- were you in front of
5
          Justice Holmes?
6
    MS. TOMASSON: I was not. It was the original trial
7
          counsel, Mr. Myhre, but I have spoken to him about
8
          those proceedings. I may be able to answer a
9
          question if --
10
    THE COURT: Well, I'm just wondering, Mr. Fox had said
         that he made these same arguments in front of
11
12
          Justice Holmes.
13
    MS. TOMASSON: He did --
    THE COURT: What was --
14
15
    MS. TOMASSON: -- as I understand it.
16
    THE COURT: What was Justice Holmes' response, other
17
          than denying the application?
18
    MS. TOMASSON: Her response was that it -- and this is
19
          a quote, that he appeared to be trying to
20
         manipulate her in his submissions because he also
21
         brought audio recordings to the court that he
22
         played where he had conversations with people at
23
         the --
24
    THE ACCUSED:
                  IRCC.
25
    MS. TOMASSON: -- IRCC --
26
    THE ACCUSED: And CBSA.
27
    MS. TOMASSON: -- and CBSA, in which he said to them,
28
          "I'm an American citizen so what's my status in
29
         Canada?" And they explained what his status was,
         and she said that by framing his questions in the
30
31
         manner that he did, without saying I -- I could be
32
         a Canadian citizen, but I think I'm an American
33
         citizen or something like that, but their answers
34
         were premised on what he told them, and that she
35
         couldn't take their answers as establishing that
36
         he was an American citizen, if -- if that makes
37
         sense. And so, she said that she disregarded
38
         those documents as well as the recordings he -- he
39
         tendered.
40
               Before the court today he also has not
41
         tendered documents that I provided him today that
42
          include copies of his Canadian passports.
43
    THE COURT: Sorry, the documents include copies of the
44
          Canadian passport?
45
                   Yes, but he has chosen not to tender
    MS. TOMASSON:
46
          those.
47
    THE ACCUSED: Um, first I'd like to respond with
```

Submissions by the Accused

BAN ON PUBLICATION 517(1) CCC

respect to those audio recordings of those telephone calls. In both of the telephone calls I provided both agencies the UCI number. So they went in the computer, they looked up where I was. It's not that I called them and said, "I'm a U.S. citizen, do I have any status in Canada?" I answered all of their questions. I provided them the UCI number, so they knew exactly who they were talking to. I strongly disagree with Justice Holmes' claim that I was trying to misrepresent anything.

Also, those recordings of those phone calls are also on the website, and so anybody, including yourself, can go to the website and listen to them for yourselves.

Now, as for these documents here that the Crown is referring to, the purpose of providing these documents to the court and to the Crown is to show that -- because I often wondered why it is that the Canadian Government would allow somebody who's not a Canadian citizen to be deported to Canada, and how ICE was able to get travel documents.

What I got from IRCC were these applications. It shows that either Homeland Security or the Canadian Consulate, forged the applications that I had filled out to obtain those emergency travel documents, and it's right here, clearly in different handwriting and such. That was the purpose of providing these. Now --

THE COURT: Sir, when you say "these" what are you what --

THE ACCUSED: Oh

THE COURT: -- what are "these"?

THE ACCUSED: -- these are applications for emergency travel documents.

THE COURT: Oh.

THE COURT: On.

THE ACCUSED: When a person is being deported, let's say from the United States to Canada, you have to fill out a passport application which is then used to issue an emergency travel document that is used to allow the person to enter the country. And in these cases, as I said, either ICE or the Canadian Consulate modified the information I had put on the emergency travel documents. For example, where it says which country I was born in and I put USA, and they scribbled that out and put

```
Canada on there.
2
    THE COURT:
                Let me ask you this.
3
    THE ACCUSED:
                   Sure.
4
    THE COURT: And I'm not -- I -- I'm going to
5
          deliberate. Quite frankly, I'm going to give my
6
          decision this afternoon --
7
    THE ACCUSED: Sure.
8
    THE COURT: -- just because lunchbreak is at 12:30.
9
         But if -- let's say I were to release you, what's
10
          your plan?
11
    THE ACCUSED: Well, I'll be honest, I haven't even put
12
          any thought into that because as I said, I really
13
          don't think I'm going to be released. But my plan
14
         would be, first I would have to go back to the
15
         Belkin House, see if they have any beds there.
16
         not, then I would go back to the Yukon, see if
17
         they have any beds there. Then if not, then I
18
         would go around to all the different shelters
19
         until I find a bed. And I would continue to try
20
         to get these conditions removed, and Justice
21
         Holmes is likely going to continue to deny those
22
          requests. I quess that would be the extent of it.
23
    THE COURT: Okay. All right. Well, listen.
24
          appreciate your submissions, thank you very much.
25
    THE ACCUSED:
                  Thank you.
26
    THE COURT: Ms. Tomasson, it's now 12:15.
                                                I need to --
27
         and Mr. Fox, I need to obviously consider the
28
          information that you've given to me.
                                                This is, as
29
         much as you both have the benefit of giving some
30
         thought to what you're going to say to the court,
31
          I've just received it for the first time, and so I
32
         need to process it a bit, and then be able to
         articulate my decision in a way that is clear,
33
34
         concise and understandable. So obviously that
35
         takes a little bit of time.
36
               So why don't we come back, I'm going to
37
          suggest we come back at 2:30. I have an
38
         engagement after a little bit of lunch hour, and
39
         so why don't we come back at 2:30 and I'll have my
40
          decision for you, okay?
41
    THE ACCUSED: Certainly, and I would say, if you want
42
         to take much longer, a few days or so, I have no
43
          opposition to that.
44
    THE COURT: Okay, I appreciate that, Mr. Fox, thank
               And if I find as I'm putting together my
45
          you.
46
          reasons that I could use more time, I'll certainly
47
         bear that in mind.
```

```
THE ACCUSED: Okay.
2
                Okay, thanks. Ms. Tomasson, anything else?
    THE COURT:
    MS. TOMASSON: No, thank you, Your Honour.
    THE COURT: All right, thank you.
5
    THE SHERIFF: Order in court, all rise.
6
    THE COURT: Okay.
7
8
               (PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED FOR NOON RECESS)
9
               (PROCEEDINGS RECONVENED)
10
11
    THE COURT: You can have a seat, Mr. Fox.
12
    THE ACCUSED: Before we proceed, could I point out one
13
         thing? There was one other issue that I wanted to
14
         make a correction on that I overlooked in my notes
15
         earlier.
16
    THE COURT: Sure.
17
    THE ACCUSED: The Crown had said this morning that I
18
         had refused to participate in a psych assessment
19
         that was required as part of my probation, unless
20
         it was recorded. In fact, I did participate in a
21
         psych assessment in January, it was recorded, and
22
         that recording is on the website.
23
    THE COURT: Okay, thank you.
24
25
               [REASONS AT JUDICIAL INTERIM RELEASE HEARING]
26
27
    THE COURT: Okay.
28
    MS. TOMASSON: Yes, Your Honour, we'll next be dealing
29
         with his next appearance, and I'm going to suggest
         that given his -- him not being represented, that
30
31
         it should be in courtroom 102, rather than
32
         courtroom 307.
33
    THE COURT: Okay.
34
    MS. TOMASSON: That he be before a judge, rather than a
35
36
    THE COURT: Sure.
37
    MS. TOMASSON: And so, since he's been detained, I'm
38
         wondering if Mr. Fox wants to next appear in
39
         person, or by video, and I'm going --
40
    THE COURT: Mr. Fox --
41
    MS. TOMASSON: -- to suggest perhaps two days, just so
42
         we can put together some disclosure for him. But
43
         I have to determine how we're going to do that for
44
         him, given his putting it on other systems, so
45
         have to put some thought to that.
46
    THE COURT: Mr. Fox, would you -- would you prefer to
47
         attend by video or in person for subsequent --
```

```
THE ACCUSED: In --
2
    THE COURT: -- court appearances?
3
    ACCUSED:
                 In person.
4
    THE COURT:
                 In person?
5
    THE ACCUSED: Yes.
6
    THE COURT: Okay. And we'll have you attend in court
7
          102, which is a court where there's always a judge
8
         presiding, as opposed to a different court where
9
         there's a justice of the peace presiding who has
10
         limited jurisdiction, okay? Just in case you have
11
         any questions or anything needs to be addressed.
12
         All right?
13
    THE ACCUSED:
                  Yes.
14
    THE COURT: And in terms of when you come back to
15
          court, would you like to come back in -- what's
16
         today, Wednesday. Would you like to come back on
17
         Friday, or the beginning of next week, or --
18
    THE ACCUSED: I can't imagine that it could make any
19
          difference whatsoever to me.
20
    THE COURT: Ms. Tomasson, what's convenient from the
21
         Crown's standpoint, knowing Mr. Fox will appear in
22
         person with respect to disclosure?
23
    MS. TOMASSON:
                   Yes. I'm going to ask for Monday.
24
    THE COURT: One day, so --
25
    MS. TOMASSON: Sorry, Monday.
    THE COURT: Oh, Monday, I'm sorry.
26
27
    MS. TOMASSON: Monday of next week.
28
    THE COURT: So, Mr. Fox, we'll have you return on
29
         Monday, April 15th at 9:30 in court 102.
30
    THE ACCUSED: Okay.
31
    THE COURT: Okay?
32
    THE ACCUSED: Before we conclude though, I would like
33
          to say with respect to Justice Holmes' Reasons for
34
          Sentencing --
35
    THE COURT: Yes.
36
    THE ACCUSED: -- and I was going to mention this
37
          earlier, but then I thought, hmm, I'll let it go.
38
         But since it came up in your decision as well --
39
    THE COURT: Sure.
40
    THE ACCUSED: -- she makes absolutely no reference to
41
          the literally mounds and mounds of evidence that I
42
         brought at sentencing that proved Capuano was
43
         lying at trial and the hundreds of emails that
44
         Capuano had sent to me prior to 2014 where she was
45
         threatening, and being belligerent, and trying to
46
         cause problems. And even Justice Holmes herself
47
         admitted that those emails were clearly
```

```
threatening and clearly relevant, yet in the
2
         sentencing there's not a single mention of them.
3
         So I just wanted to point that out.
    THE COURT: Okay. Well listen, I appreciate you
5
         mentioning that for the completeness --
6
    THE ACCUSED: Sure.
7
    THE COURT: -- of the record. All right.
8
    MS. TOMASSON: And if I could just have the documents
9
         that were filed today returned from Mr. Fox now.
10
                  I'm sorry, you want them back from me?
    THE ACCUSED:
11
    MS. TOMASSON: Yes.
12
    THE ACCUSED: Do I not get to keep a copy of them? I
13
         mean, don't I --
14
    THE COURT: Sorry, these were documents that were filed
15
         with the court and these are copies of those
16
         documents?
17
    MS. TOMASSON: Yes, the exhibits today.
18
    THE COURT: Copies of the exhibits.
19
    THE ACCUSED: Right --
20
    THE COURT: Why do you want them --
21
    MS. TOMASSON:
                  The concern is where --
22
    THE COURT:
                That they're going to be published.
23
    MS. TOMASSON: -- where they will go at some --
24
    THE ACCUSED: But they're -
25
    MS. TOMASSON: -- eventual point when he's released.
26
    THE ACCUSED: They're either public documents or
27
         documents you got from me anyway. I mean, for
28
         example, the --
    THE COURT: I think that --
29
30
    THE ACCUSED: -- IRCC and Ministry of Social
31
         Development documents, clearly I have those; those
32
         are my documents. The probation order, well, I
33
         have that too obviously. This -- I have no idea
34
         what this is, but it's obviously something that's
35
         public record now, some case law. CBSA documents
36
         that you got from me. These IRCC documents, you
37
         want those back? The documents that you printed
38
         for me, that you got from me.
39
    THE COURT: I'm kind of -- my -- just thinking out
40
         loud, I understand your concern.
41
    THE ACCUSED: I mean, if they were filed with the
42
         court, aren't --
43
    THE COURT: They were --
44
    THE ACCUSED: -- they public record anyway?
    MS. TOMASSON: They're filed as exhibits at this point,
45
46
         Your Honour --
47
    THE COURT: Yeah.
```

```
MS. TOMASSON: -- so he would have to make an
2
         application to get them from the court record.
3
         They may --
    THE COURT: Or copies of exhibits for his assistance in
5
         conducting the bail hearing.
6
    MS. TOMASSON: Yes.
7
    THE ACCUSED: Except for the probation order, which I
8
         already have, the Ministry of Social Development
9
         document which I already have, the IRCT document
10
         which I already have. I'm sorry, I'm not clear
11
         why you're concerned that I would publish
12
         documents that I already have, and have published
13
         documents that are mine anyway.
14
                Sorry, that you have published?
    THE COURT:
15
    THE ACCUSED: Oh, yes. These IRCC documents, they're
16
         all public. This Ministry of Social Development
17
         document, it's on the website.
18
    THE COURT: Okay, so those two --
19
    THE ACCUSED: Everything is on the website.
20
    THE COURT: Which documents in particular are you
21
         concerned about, Ms. Tomasson?
22
    THE ACCUSED:
                  I mean, really, I'd like to keep the
23
         Immigration documents because I'll need those for
24
         other hearings I have coming up soon. Oh, and
25
         that Ministry of Social Development one, that's
26
         kind of critical for hearings I have coming up.
27
    MS. TOMASSON: At this point, Your Honour, the only
28
         thing that may not be currently on the website
29
         would be the disclosure order.
30
    THE ACCUSED: I don't care about that. You can have
31
         that.
32
    MS. TOMASSON: Which is Exhibit 5.
33
    THE COURT: Take the disclosure order.
34
    MS. TOMASSON:
                   Thank you, Your Honour.
35
    THE COURT: All right, thank you. All right, thanks,
36
         Mr. Fox.
37
    THE ACCUSED: Thank you.
38
    THE SHERIFF: Order in court.
39
    THE CLERK:
                   [Inaudible].
    THE COURT: Pardon me?
40
41
    THE CLERK:
                  [Inaudible].
    THE COURT: Thanks a lot.
42
43
    MS. TOMASSON: Oh, Your Honour, I'm sorry.
44
    THE COURT: Yeah.
45
    MS. TOMASSON: What we haven't addressed is the -- the
46
         request by Mr. Fox that the ban on publication -
47
    THE ACCUSED: Oh, yes.
```

```
THE COURT: All right.
2
    MS. TOMASSON: I -- I -- just so that we can address
3
          it, I --
    THE COURT: I'm going to --
5
    MS. TOMASSON: -- we --
6
    THE COURT: I'm going to leave the ban on publication
7
          in place while there's an ongoing investigation
8
          for which you provided information to the court
9
          that's actually germane to that.
10
     THE ACCUSED: Really?
11
     THE COURT: Yeah.
12
    THE ACCUSED: Okay.
13
    THE COURT: Okay? Thank you.
14
    MS. TOMASSON: Thank you, Your Honour.
15
    THE SHERIFF: Order in court.
16
17
               (PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED TO APRIL 15, 2019 AT
18
               9:30 A.M. IN COURTROOM 102)
19
20
21
22
23
    Transcriber: C. Jones
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
```

I hereby certify the foregoing to be a true and accurate transcript of the evidence recorded on a sound recording apparatus, transcribed to the best of my skill and ability.

C. Jones

Court Transcriber