

Burnaby RCMP 2019-10877

R. v. Patrick Henry FOX

Breach of Probation

Supplemental Report

October 3, 2019

On September 27, 2019 Constable Brown received a request from Crown Counsel with respect to accused Patrick Henry Fox's trial matter, advising that the accused had requested additional information with respect to video surveillance obtained from United States Customs and Border Protection (U.S. CBP).

The following has been compiled by Constable Brown, and provided in response to the requests for information from Crown:

V2



Constable Brown can confirm that the previously disclosed video clips provided by U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Blaine Command Center, forwarded to Crown Counsel within Disclosure 9.0 on August 8, 2019, are the only video ever received from USA authorities.

V2



On September 27, 2019 Constable Brown contacted Rod O'Dell, Senior Paralegal with the U.S. Border & Customs Protection (CBP) Port of Blaine, to enquire about whether any additional footage of the dealings with Mr. Fox at the Blaine Command Center on March 15, 2019 were available and if yes, could be received prior to the next court date of October 8, 2019 (requested a response prior to October 4, 2019). The request sent at 1230 hours, as follows:

Rod,

This is a follow-up request to the previous assistance you provided to the Burnaby RCMP back in August, relating to the CCTV/video clips provided for our investigation. The trial matter in court commenced (August 12-15, 2019), but was not concluded at that time & additional dates were scheduled (starting October 8, 2019).

I just received a communication from our prosecutor, based upon a disclosure request from the accused (who is defending himself in court) regarding his dealings at the U.S. border with CBP officers.

I am writing to you in an effort to determine whether there would be any way to secure CCTV/video footage of our accused (Patrick FOX, aka Richard REISS/RIESS) inside the CBP building dealing with officers? We would be interested in any footage you might be able to supply prior to October 4, 2019.

If no, a response indicating so with any relevant reasons would be appreciated, in order to advise to our prosecutor.

Thank you for your investigative efforts on our behalf.

Kirsty
Burnaby RCMP HROU

The following responses were received from O'Dell:

September 27, 2019 at 1302 hours:

Kirsty:

I believe the video we released was everything that was archived for that encounter. To be certain, I have reached out to key persons to see if there is anything additional. The larger problem is time; if there is additional video, time required to re-process and redact our secure video system will be substantially past trial deadlines, even for a small amount of video.

I'll get back to you on the existence of additional footage.

Regards,
Rod

October 3, 2019 at 0904 hours:

Good morning Kirsty:

Blaine Command Center has located additional video for Fox/Reiss while he was in our custody. BCC advises there is about 3.5 hours of footage with numerous CBP officers present that will require redaction. I don't have a firm estimate of the time needed to redact the officers out and convert the file to an open-source format, as the lab will have to review the footage to make that determination. Based on previous work done, however, I can safely say it would be at least 30-40 days, depending on what the lab gets ahead of our request. There are only a small group of technicians available and CBP has consolidated all video requests nation-wide into the Chicago lab, significantly boosting processing times compared to what we could previously achieve when we sent our vids to San Francisco.

Regards,
Rod

Constable Brown notes that the extent to which the U.S. CBP is required to review and redact video surveillance footage of their investigative practices and protocols within the border crossing buildings, as previously explained by O'Dell during the original requests for assistance, resulted in the lengthy response time for the original request, in relation to the preparations and disclosure for the original trial dates for this matter. The U.S. CBP was able to provide three video clips showing the accused, as disclosed on August 8, 2019, in an expedited fashion because there was no redaction required for those clips and in order to satisfy the approaching trial date.

The request for additional video surveillance from the Blaine Command Center, which would require redaction of persons and certain investigative aspects of the U.S. CBP practices, cannot be provided by the next scheduled court date per the response from O'Dell.

Cst. Kirsty Brown

Burnaby RCMP-GRC High Risk Offender Unit

47608/076554

October 3, 2019

BURNABY RCMP
NARRATIVE TEXT HARDCOPY

GO# 1202 2019-10877

Narrative: **OCCURRENCE REPORT - 17**
Supplemental Report - Disclosure 11.0
Author: **076554 BROWN, KIRSTY**
Related date: **Friday, 2019-Oct-04 at: 09:18**
Related event: **GO 1202201910877**

Burnaby RCMP 2019-10877
R. v. Patrick Henry FOX
Breach of Probation

Supplemental Report
October 3, 2019

On September 27, 2019 Constable Brown received a request from Crown Counsel with respect to accused Patrick Henry Fox's trial matter, advising that the accused had requested additional information with respect to video surveillance obtained from United States Customs and Border Protection (U.S. CBP).

The following has been compiled by Constable Brown, and provided in response to the requests for information from Crown:

V2

Constable Brown can confirm that the previously disclosed video clips provided by U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Blaine Command Center, forwarded to Crown Counsel within Disclosure 9.0 on August 8, 2019, are the only video ever received from USA authorities.

V2

On September 27, 2019 Constable Brown contacted Rod O'Dell, Senior Paralegal with the U.S. Border & Customs Protection (CBP) Port of Blaine, to enquire about whether any additional footage of the dealings with Mr. Fox at the Blaine Command Center on March 15, 2019 were available and if yes, could be received prior to the next court date of October 8, 2019 (requested a response prior to October 4, 2019). The request sent at 1230 hours, as follows:

Rod,

This is a follow-up request to the previous assistance you provided to the Burnaby RCMP back in August, relating to the CCTV/video clips provided for our investigation. The trial matter in court commenced (August 12-15, 2019), but was not concluded at that time & additional dates were scheduled (starting October 8, 2019).

I just received a communication from our prosecutor, based upon a disclosure request from the accused (who is defending himself in court) regarding his dealings at the U.S. border with CBP officers.

I am writing to you in an effort to determine whether there would be any way to secure CCTV/video footage of our accused (Patrick FOX, aka Richard REISS/RIESS) inside the CBP building dealing with

*** CONFIDENTIAL ***

	BURNABY RCMP NARRATIVE TEXT HARDCOPY
	GO# 1202 2019-10877

officers? We would be interested in any footage you might be able to supply prior to 2019.

October 4,

If no, a response indicating so with any relevant reasons would be appreciated, in order to advise to our prosecutor.

Thank you for your investigative efforts on our behalf.

Kirsty

Burnaby RCMP HROU

The following responses were received from O'Dell:

September 27, 2019 at 1302 hours:

Kirsty:

I believe the video we released was everything that was archived for that encounter. To be certain, I have reached out to key persons to see if there is anything additional. The larger problem is time; if there is additional video, time required to re-process and redact our secure video system will be substantially past trial deadlines, even for a small amount of video.

I'll get back to you on the existence of additional footage.

Regards,

Rod

October 3, 2019 at 0904 hours:

Good morning Kirsty:

Blaine Command Center has located additional video for Fox/Reiss while he was in our custody. BCC advises there is about 3.5 hours of footage with numerous CBP officers present that will require redaction. I don't have a firm estimate of the time needed to redact the officers out and convert the file to an open-source format, as the lab will have to review the footage to make that determination. Based on previous work done, however, I can safely say it would be at least 30-40 days, depending on what the lab gets ahead of our request. There are only a small group of technicians available and CBP has consolidated all video requests nation-wide into the Chicago lab, significantly boosting processing times compared to what we could previously achieve when we sent our vids to San Francisco.

Regards,

Rod

Constable Brown notes that the extent to which the U.S. CBP is required to review and redact video surveillance footage of their investigative practices and protocols within the border crossing buildings, as previously explained by O'Dell during the original requests for assistance, resulted in the lengthy response time for the original request, in relation to the preparations and disclosure for the original trial dates for this matter. The U.S. CBP was able to provide three video clips showing the accused, as disclosed on August 8, 2019, in an expedited fashion because there was no redaction required for those clips and in order to satisfy the approaching trial date.

*** CONFIDENTIAL ***

	BURNABY RCMP NARRATIVE TEXT HARDCOPY GO# 1202 2019-10877
--	--

The request for additional video surveillance from the Blaine Command Center, which would require redaction of persons and certain investigative aspects of the U.S. CBP practices, cannot be provided by the next scheduled court date per the response from O'Dell.

Cst. Kirsty Brown
Burnaby RCMP-GRC High Risk Offender Unit
47608/076554
October 3, 2019

***** END OF HARDCOPY *****

***** CONFIDENTIAL *****

Patrick Fox
1451 Kinsmen Ave
Port Coquitlam, BC
V3C 1S2

September 22, 2019

Attn: Bernie Wolfe
Crown Counsel
#204 - 227 Main St.
Vancouver, BC V6A 2S8

Re: R. v. Fox; Court File: 244068-BC-5

Mr. Wolfe:

I shall try to keep this as focused and concise as possible. If, however, that results in any ambiguity, please let me know and I will gladly provide a more verbose explanation.

1. Copies of our written correspondence.

Please provide me hard copies of all of our correspondence. Our correspondence is NOT part of "Crown's disclosure", and I must be permitted to keep a copy for my own records.

beyond having to return the laptop. Therefore, I again request you discontinue the practice of only including electronic copies on the disclosure laptop.

You may recall I had already brought this issue up months ago in court.

2. Subpoenas

I intend to request or apply for numerous subpoenas on October 8, 2019. I have already been in contact with numerous parties to request their attendance and testimony. Not surprisingly, I have received absolutely no response from each of the parties at CBA - including Miss Pereira.

I have not been able to find any information on procedures related to subpoenas in the law library so I will have absolutely no idea what I'm doing in that respect. However, every treatise on Canadian law and every SCC case I've read which touches on the topic of the role of Crown Counsel in the Canadian justice system, which I've read, all agree that it is the role of Crown Counsel to put the truth before the trier of fact - NOT just to get a conviction at any cost and certainly NOT to

willingly mislead the court on matters of fact. So, to that end, you would obviously WANT the court to hear from CBSA, under oath, on these matters. I mean, whether I left voluntarily or was denied admission, is critical to the question of guilt on these charges. And since I have multiple documents, including my birth certificate, and IRCC and CBSA records showing I was born outside Canada and IRCC acknowledging I was never issued a Certificate of Canadian Citizenship... well, you must want to have someone from CBSA testify to refute those documents, right?

3. Requesting another continuance.

I intend to request another continuance on October 8, 2019. I have, since August 16, 2019 sent out numerous letters/requests to numerous parties and agencies, including CBSA, CBP, Steve Riess, RCMP, et cetera, requesting various artefacts and testimony. I am still waiting on much of it.

It is my understanding I have the Charter right to present whatever evidence I believe will help to prove my innocence, and as long as I am making

reasonable efforts to pursue / obtain that evidence, I do not believe I can be forced to trial before I am ready to make full answer and defense based on that evidence which is known (or reasonably believed) to exist. Particularly when that evidence is known or believed to be in the possession of the government (Hint: I intend to trap Shen-Maria Pereira in a lie with this).

As for CBTA Officer Gill's statement - it is nonsensical! He is never trying to suggest the ICE officer made the statement, but ICE had nothing to do with anything on March 15. It seems to me that more investigation into Gill's most recent statement is warranted - I will look into that from my end. I am currently awaiting that information. See, definitely going to need at least a few more months to gather evidence.

4. Request for assistance with certain evidence.

There is certain evidence I intend to use during my testimony, which is available on the website. I hereby request your assistance in obtaining it. The easiest thing would be to first put a copy of the entire website on the disclosure laptop. Your IT

people should be able to do that because they did it for me clearing the original, criminal harassment case.

You might be thinking "But the website is not online right now". Well, I'm sure VPD has made a copy of it as part of their 'ongoing investigation'. Otherwise, I have copies of the website, the source material, and all my files on numerous servers in numerous countries around the world. Also, I'm sure there's a copy on 'archive.org'.

Specifically, there are a number of recordings I will be referring to and playing during my testimony; and my birth certificate. All of which are on the version of the website which went public in March.

5. Your statement about following up with the RCMP about the possibility of CBSA testifying.

This was actually discussed between us AFTER the hearing - just before I exited the courtroom. So it would not be on the DAK. Henceforth I shall make sure we have all such discussions while the judge is present and the DAK system is recording; or I have one of my digital recorders

remembering; in order to ensure there are no future discrepancies about what was said.

Since I have no way of proving the statement was made, and since I've already initiated communication with CBSA regarding testimony, we can consider this issue moot.

6. Additional or missing CBP video.

May you confirm with the RCMP that the three video clips from CBP, which have already been disclosed to me (i.e. the ones outside the secondary inspection building) are the only ones they have received? In particular, I'm interested in why the video of me inside the building, at the counter, being surrounded by 5 or 6 CBP officers was not included.

7. Lies and inconsistencies.

On July 26, 2019, I told you I had sent you a letter earlier in the week, wherein I had made reference to CBSA's video footage of me at the border on March 15, 2019. I said to you "I'm

sure you've received that letter by now." You responded that you had not, and you feigned surprise at it's contents.

However, in the material I received from you on July 30 there is a letter from you, dated July 23, 2019, wherein you refer to my letter and you respond to some of the specific points I had made in it - the very letter which you claimed on July 26, 2019 that you had not yet received.

So let me be clear: You received a letter from me on or before July 23, 2019; you responded to that letter on July 23, 2019; then you deliberately, falsely stated on July 26, 2019 that you had not yet received that letter. So, you lied!


There have been numerous other false statements but I'm not going to write them here because this letter is long enough already.

Let me also say, I don't believe your claim that you had no knowledge of the possibility of the CBSA videos before I brought it up on July 26, 2019. I just don't see how it could have been possible that you read the RCMP's narratives, with their multiple references to requesting CCTV

footage from various sources yet it never once occurred to you that it seemed strange that they never asked CBSA for CCTV footage - particularly since I openly admitted to presenting myself to CBSA before turning myself in to CBP - and I even made a point of NOT saying anything to Patts about CBSA denying me admission so that the RCMP would be more inclined to request the video (so they could use it against me).

I suppose that covers the most critical stuff for now.

Sincerely,



Patrick Fox

Patrick Fox
1451 Kinsmen Ave
Port Coquitlam, BC
V3C 1S2

September 15, 2019

Attn: Crown Counsel
#204 - 228 Main St
Vancouver, BC V6A 2S8

Re: Request for case status;
Vancouver Police Dept file no. 19-49074

Dear Sir/Miss:

I am writing to request you inform me of the status of the above referenced VPD case. Particularly, whether or not the file has been forwarded to your office yet and, if so, whether or not charges have been approved.

If the Crown has decided NOT to approve a charge of criminal harassment may you please inform me of why? Thank you.

Sincerely,



Patrick Fox

Patrick Foy
1451 Kinsmen Ave
Port Coquitlam, BC
V3C 1S2

September 13, 2019

Attn: Bernie Wolfe
Crown Counsel
204 - 222 Main St
Vancouver, BC V6A 2S8

Re: R. v. Foy; Disclosure laptop - again

Dear Mr. Wolfe:

A few weeks ago you sent me a disclosure laptop with an unnecessary, second password and did not provide me that second password. When I sent you a letter to bring it to your attention you promptly swapped it out with another unit which only had the hard drive password enabled and, as such, I was able to use it.

And now today, you swapped out the laptop again - presumably to provide some updated disclosure - and much to my chagrin, it is that same laptop

that had the sep influences BIOS user password and guess what: It STILL has the additional user password and I've still not been informed of what that password is!!! The laptop is, literally, completely useless to me.

When you have an opportunity, may you please either provide me the user password for the laptop or swap it out for one that it can actually use? Thanks.

Sincerely,



Patrick Fox

Patrick Foy
1451 Kinsler Ave
Port Coquitlam, BC
V3C 1S2

September 7, 2019

Attn: Bernie Wolfe
Crown Counsel
222 Main St
Vancouver, BC V6A 2S8

Re: R.v. Foy; Clarification

Dear Mr. Wolfe:

I would like to clarify one point upon which I believe there might be some misunderstanding.

My willingness to remain in custody indefinitely, literally, while I acquire as much irrefutable proof as possible to support my upcoming testimony about CBSA, the RCMP, and Crown Counsel (yes, you specifically) going and going to great lengths to suppress and destroy evidence, has absolutely nothing to do with your claim of seeking 13-15 months imprisonment. Even if you had claimed

you were only seeking one day of imprisonment I would still be more than willing to sit in jail for as long as it would take to prove: (1) my innocence; and (2) the corruption and misconduct you and your cohorts continue to engage in.

Moreover, I think we both know there is absolutely no way you will get a conviction on the failure to report charge - being that I was in custody at the time. And, regardless of what sentence you claim to be seeking, I have never believed, at any point, that even if I were convicted of the two other counts that I would be sentenced to more than the 4 months that I had already been in custody by the time of the trial.

And even more so, I completely believe that after the judge sees the cross examination of your witnesses, he intended to acquit me any way - even without me testifying or providing any additional evidence in my favor. And I believed this BEFORE requesting the adjournment!

So, my willingness to sit in custody for another 6 months, or 9 months, or 24 months - until I have all the proof I need to prove the statements I intend to make on the witness stand are true -

is based solely on presenting/exposing the truth. And I believe I have the Charter right to make full answer and defense, and to present any and all evidence which I believe is relevant to proving my innocence. Right?

And finally, I would like to point out that at the bail review YOU are the one who insisted the trial was only a couple of weeks away and so keeping me in custody would not be that big of a deal - even though I had been insisting since May that we would not be ready for trial by August because I was still pursuing evidence! And YOU are the one who insisted 4 days would be more than enough time for trial; then you took up almost all that time with YOUR evidence, leaving only one day for my evidence. I am going to assume you are a very experienced and very competent lawyer - which means you did those things deliberately. It's that the kind of staff you consider "doing your job to the best of your ability"?

I hope this helped to clarify some of my position.

Sincerely,


Patrick Fox

Patrick Fox
1451 Kinsmen Ave
Port Coquitlam, BC
V3C 1S2

August 31, 2019

Attn: Bernie Wolfe
Proven Counsel
222 Main St
Vancouver, BC V6A 2S8

Re: R. v. Fox; Court File #: 244069-5-BC;
Disclosure laptop

Mr. Wolfe:

On August 30, 2019, a few hours after it had mailed the prior letter, dated August 30, 2019, to you it had received the disclosure laptop. Therefore, you may disregard that particular inquiry of that letter.

However, please note, the laptop it received on August 30, 2019, is configured not only with a hard drive password (which it already have), but also with a BIOS user password - which is required in order to boot the laptop. This additional password has

not been provided. Therefore, I am unable to boot the laptop. Therefore, I am unable to use the laptop. Therefore, I am unable to access the disclosure material.

May you please forward me the BIOS user password; or remove that password from the configuration?

Having two BIOS level passwords, ie the hard drive password (which also encrypts the entire hard drive, making it inaccessible from any other computer), and the user password, is redundant and does not make the laptop and it's contents any more secure than having just the hard drive password (which it already had). Both passwords prevent the system from booting until the correct password is entered. The hard drive password is sufficient - the user password adds nothing, it is redundant. Do you recall our discussion about incompetent IT people? This is a perfect example of my point of that discussion. Unless, of course, this is just another deliberate tactic to delay or discourage providing disclosure material.

Sincerely,



Patrick Fox

Patrick Foy
1451 Karpisevsky Ave
Port Coquitlam, BC
V3C 1S2

August 30, 2019

Attn: Bernie Wolfe
Crown Counsel
222 Main Street
Vancouver, BC V6A 2S8

Re: R.v. Foy; Court File #: 244069-5-BC

Dear Mr. Wolfe:

It has now been over two weeks since the trial has been adjourned on August 15, 2019.

On August 15, 2019, I stated I intended to pursue various avenues for the purpose of obtaining physical evidence to support the testimony I intend to provide in this matter. And, I have since commenced those pursuits. I have been diligent to keep verifiable records of that which I will provide to court on October 8, 2019.

You also stated, on August 15, 2019, that you would

pursue certain, specific avenues, including:

- Requesting the RCMP follow up with CBSA regarding whether or not CBSA has any records relating to my interaction with them on March 15, 2019;
- Requesting somebody from CBSA testify regarding my interaction with them on March 15, 2019. In this respect it would be ideal if it could be one of the officers I actually interacted with;
- You stated that you would return the disclosure material to me because, as you put it, you "can't leave me in the dark".

May you please inform me of the status of these matters?

Thank you.

Sincerely,



Patrick Fox

Patrick Fox
1451 Kinsmen Ave
Port Cowichan, BC
V3C 1S2

July 21, 2019

Attn: Bernie Wolfe
Crown Counsel
204 - 222 Main St
Vancouver, BC V6A 2S8

Re: R. v. Fox
Court File: 244069-5-BC

Mr. Wolfe:

I am writing to inform you that I stand by my prior assertions that my citizenship, or more specifically, my lack of citizenship or immigration status in Canada, is critical to my defense.

Previously, both you and the court have tried to convince me it is not relevant to the current charges.

I am going to assume the Crown intends to continue it's position that it believes I am a Canadian citizen, by virtue

of being born Ricky Riass in Ontario, offspring of Steve Riass and Peggy Sampogna (nee Papin). And, that being the case - my status in Canada being disputed by the Crown - I would, again, insist that the easiest and most definitive way to resolve the issue of whether or not I was born Ricky Riass (and therefore, whether or not I am a Canadian citizen) will be for the Crown to accept Steve Riass's (and presumably Peggy Sampogna's) offer to participate in a DNA test.

Obviously, I realize pursuing the DNA test will delay the trial, and I would be okay with that for the purpose this DNA test. Also, that would give the RCMP more time to obtain the video footage of me at the point of actually crossing the border. Although I would strongly prefer they obtain CBSA's video and include all footage of me being escorted by a CBSA officer from the checkpoint buildings to the actual border.

If you have any questions please let me know.

Sincerely,



Patrick Fox

Patrick Fox
1451 Kingsway Ave
Port Coquitlam, BC
V3C 1S2

July 14, 2019

Attn: Bernie Wolfe
Crown Counsel
222 Main St, Suite 204
Vancouver, BC V6A 2S8
Fax: 604-660-4347

Re: R. v. Fox; Request for case law queries

Mr. Wolfe:

As discussed in court, I am forwarding to you a list of queries which I respectfully request you execute on the CANLII.ORG website, and return the search results to me so I may review them for relevant authorities.

For each stated query I request the following:

- The query/search string be entered verbatim, including all quotation marks, parenthesis, et

cetera.

- The query be executed once for the SCC and all of the Courts of Appeal (combined); and once for all of the Provincial and Supreme/Superior Courts.
- At least the first 40 results be provided for each query (unless the query returns less than 40 results, obviously). I believe, by default, CANLI will only display the first 25 results automatically - you need to scroll to the bottom of the page to force it to display more.

Be advised, the reason it took me so long to get this to you is because the judge did instruct me to first attend the law library at the jail to see what I could find on the computer, and only after that to request your assistance. So, on July 4, 2019 I submitted a request to go to the law library, and on July 11, 2019 I was provided up to one hour of access.

As I've stated repeatedly, the computer in the law library only contains the case synopsis, and only for BC, AB, SK, and MB courts. It is useless! For example,

when I search on the law library computer, for the following:


"732.1(3)" conflict *

I find only 4 matches. As you can see, when you enter the same search criteria into CANLII, you get many more results.

I expect once I read some of the cases discovered from the attached queries then I will have some more, better defined requests.

Thank you for your time and assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,



Patrick Fox

Queries to run in CANLI

1: "732.1" conflicting conditions

2: "be of good behaviour" conflict

3: probation immigration status

4: "be of good behaviour" immigration

5: "be of good behaviour" deport

Patrick Fox
1451 Kinsway Ave
Port Coquitlam, BC
V3C 1S2

June 17, 2019

Attn: Bernie Wolfe
Office of Crown Counsel
222 Main St.
Vancouver, BC V6A 2S8

Re: R.V. Fox; Next PTC

Mr. Wolfe:

May you please inform me, at your earliest opportunity, when the next Trial Conference is scheduled for? The jail's information system does not show any group orders prior to August 12, 2019.

Thank you.

Sincerely,



Patrick Fox

Patrick Fox
1451 Kinsway Ave
Port Courtenay, BC
V3C 1S2

June 6, 2019

Attn: Bernie Wolfe
Office of Crown Counsel
222 Main St.
Vancouver, BC V6A 2S8

Re: R. v. Fox

Mr. Wolfe:

1. Please let me know once you've made a decision about whether or not you will be assisting me with printing case law and queries.

Obviously, the first issue I will need cases for is the question of whether the court may impose probation conditions which violate the law or which force the accused to violate the law. I'm sure you know that such a condition cannot be imposed, but you seem intent on challenging that anyway. So, I would need a query run in

canlii.org, along the lines of:

"732.1(3)(h)" violate
"732.1(3)(h)" immigration
"732.1(3)(h)" unenforceable

With results only from the courts of appeal and the SCC. I would need, say, the first 40 or 50 search results. Then, depending on whether or not there was anything useful at the court of appeal level, I would request the same queries run for the provincial and Supreme/Supremes courts.

Obviously, this all relates to the legitimacy and enforceability of the conditions requiring me to remain in Canada - in violation of the immigration laws, thereby forcing me to violate condition I (Keep the peace and be of good behavior.).

2. And, once I prove that you and the court are wrong, and that such conditions are invalid, then the question of my citizenship will become paramount.

Now, I realize that a lower court (the Provincial

Court) cannot make a finding which would, necessarily, conflict with a prior finding of a higher court (the BC Supreme Court). So, obviously, this is an issue we're going to have to address before trial: Justice Holmes says a declaration from IRCC is not sufficient to conclude I am not a Canadian citizen, even though IRCC is the ONLY entity empowered to definitively declare someone is or is not a Canadian citizen, and clearly every other judge who has looked at the evidence I've provided agrees "there is a serious problem here".

Obviously, in order for me to have a fair trial, the judge is going to have to consider the evidence independently of Justice Holmes' ludicrous "findings".

3. As required by paragraph 20 of the disclosure laptop agreement, I have had to return the laptop to the facility staff because they keep double checking me. This makes it impossible for me to access the disclosure material.

I have no control over being double checked so I request you kindly contact NRC and work something out so I can actually use the laptop.


4. I am still unable to receive any evidence from my associates and/or witnesses, on CD/DVD (e.g. audio/video files, binary/computer data), at NFPC. I am also unable to obtain photocopies of documentary evidence. Obviously, this is precluding me from making full answer and defense.

I have, amongst other things, audio recordings of my interactions with CBSA and COP on March 17, 2019; as well as additional telephone conversations with CBSA, prior to that; which are critical to my defense. I have no interest in you hearing these recordings prior to the trial, in open court, so having them sent to you and you forwarding them to me will not be an option.

5. I request you provide me hard copies of our correspondence rather than putting it on the laptop because I will need to retain a copy after the laptop is returned to you.

If you have any questions or concerns please let me know.

Sincerely,



Patrick Fox

Patrick Fox
1451 Kinsmen Ave
Port Coquitlam, BC
V3C 1S2

May 9, 2019

Attn: Bernie Wolf
Office of Crown Counsel
222 Main Street
Vancouver, BC V6A 2S8

Re: R. v. Fox; PTC

Mr. Wolf:

Further to my previous letter requesting you schedule a pretrial conference in this matter, please be advised the staff of NFPC is, again, actively impeding my ability to prepare my defense. I am informing you of this because it is another matter that will need to be addressed at the PTC.

I had encountered the same issues while I was detained at NFPC, representing myself on the original charges. I had raised the issues before Justice Holmes and she requested Mark Myhre (Crown Counsel) speak

with the jail to see if the issues could be resolved. That did resolve some of the issues, such as the jail providing me photocopies of legal material/correspondence; but not others, such as the ability for me to receive critical evidence in the form of audio/video files on DVD.

The jail is, again, refusing to provide ANY assistance, such as photocopies - Obviously, this is precluding me from being able to make full answer and defense.

And finally, may you please inform me of the status of scheduling a TTC, and of providing me all of the disclosure? I still have not even received a copy of the information/indictment; nor do I even know whether you intend to proceed with summary conviction or indictable offenses.

Thanks!

Sincerely,



Patrick Fox

Patrick Fox
CS# 10582500
1451 Kinsway Ave
Port Coquitlam, BC
V3C 1S2

April 30, 2019

Attn: Bernie Wolf
Office of Crown Counsel
222 Main St
Vancouver, BC V6A 2S8

Re: R. v. Fox

Mr. Wolf:

I understand you are the Crown Counsel assigned to the case I am currently being detained on. I, therefore, respectfully request you schedule a pretrial conference for the earliest available date as I am confident you will be opposing at least one of the following requests and I will need to put them before the court. And, as I have no direct access to the court registry or to your calendar, it makes much more sense for you to schedule the PTC at a time which is conducive for you and the court.

I hereby request the following:

- A copy of all disclosure material in the custody or control of Crown Counsel, relating to my current charges, including all correspondence with US authorities;
- Crown Counsel obtain, from Steve Riess and Peggy Sampogna, DNA samples for the purpose of performing appropriate DNA tests to determine whether there is any biological connection between them and me (specifically, whether I am their offspring). This is critical to the question of whether or not I am a Canadian citizen and whether or not I have any status in Canada - if I have no status in Canada then the probation conditions prohibiting me from leaving BC and from being within 100 meters of the US border are invalid and unenforceable (it also means the US screwed up big time by deporting me here and Canada screwed up big time by allowing them to).

I would like to point out that Steve Riess has already offered to provide Mark Myhre such a DNA sample. Myhre refused to provide that, and the court (Justice Holmes) refused to order Myhre to provide it in the context of my application to remove the condition

prohibiting me from leaving BC/Canada. However, due to the current charges it is no longer a discretionary issue for the judge in the context of an application to remove a probation condition - it is now an issue of my right to a fair trial and to make full answer and defense.

I anticipate you will oppose this request because when the MVA test results come back negative it is going to make the BC Supreme Court (specifically, Justice Holmes), the Crown Counsel, the US Immigration Court, and US Homeland Security look extremely bad/incompetent/vindictive. However, I have the Charter right to make full answer and defense.


- Please inform me of which police agency is handling the supposed investigation into the DESICAPMNO.COM website, as I have been informed they have seized some property of mine and I would like to get it back.
- A copy of the Crown's witness list for the trial.

With respect to the DNA samples from Steve Rios and Peggy Sampson, please be advised I will also

continue to try to communicate with them directly to obtain DNA samples, however to date I have been unable to establish contact with them.

And finally, I request you return a copy of this letter to me for my records as the fact is, again, refusing to provide photocopies even though I am representing my self.

Sincerely,

A stylized, handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to be 'Patrick Fox', with a large, sweeping loop at the end.

Patrick Fox