

NOTICE OF LIABILITY FOR THE ACT OF TREASON

<DATE>

<YOUR FIRST LAST NAME>

<YOUR MAILING ADDRESS>

<YOUR CONTACT INFO>

ATTN: <FIRST AND LAST NAME OF PERPETRATOR>

RE: THE ACT OF TREASON

NOTICE OF LIABILITY:

This is your first and only official Notice of Liability.

1. <YOUR FIRST LAST NAME>, a private human living soul, of lawful and legal age of majority presents this notice of liability to <FIRST AND LAST NAME OF PERPETRATOR>, another private human living soul, of lawful and legal age of majority. If <FIRST AND LAST NAME OF PERPETRATOR> does not rectify the matter of breach of privacy, breach of the right to informed consent, loss of liberty in the form of reduced mobility and property ownership, and violations of the Criminal Code of Canada section 46(2), there may be a private collection and civil proceeding to seek compensation and a request in civil court for an equity decision to rectify the matter by way of an order for, <FIRST AND LAST NAME OF PERPETRATOR>, to cease and desist their relationship with the WEF/UN and participation in Strategic Plan and/or the Sustainable Plan and/or the 15-Minute City plan.

STATEMENT OF FACTS:

1. <FIRST AND LAST NAME OF PERPETRATOR> without the consent of <YOUR FIRST AND LAST NAME> has committed treason by becoming a member/participant of the World Economic Forum¹/United Nations Sustainable Development Goals 2030² Agenda.
2. The implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals 2030 agenda set by this foreign entity undermines our human rights and fundamental freedoms currently protected in Canadian common law and codified laws such as the Canadian Bill of Rights.
3. For example, the municipal Strategic Plan and/or the Sustainable Plan and/or the 15-Minute City Plan intend to violate the Canadian Bill of Rights section 1(a) the right to liberty by restricting mobility to a 15-minute radius and consumption of food and clothing, etc. and the right to enjoyment of property by restricting vehicles and other property³.
4. As well personal data held by the city is being shared between different programs and private agencies including foreign bodies.
5. Canada is a democratic government where the people are sovereign. Government is only supposed to act by consent of the people and in the interest of the people.
6. Our interests and needs are not being considered and we are not being meaningfully consulted regarding these changes.

HARM CAUSED:

1. <YOUR FIRST LAST NAME> is a victim of treason.
2. <YOUR FIRST LAST NAME>'s tax dollars are being spent in preparation of the 15-Minute Cities without consultation of the public nor legal authority.
3. Privacy of <YOUR FIRST AND LAST NAME> is currently being breached where personal information is not kept private and there is no consent provided to share the information. This breach of privacy puts <YOUR FIRST

1. <https://www.weforum.org/organizations/c40-cities-climate-leadership-group>

2. <https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda>

3. https://www.c40.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/2270_C40_CBE_MainReport_250719_original.pdf, see consumption table on Page 20

NOTICE OF LIABILITY FOR THE ACT OF TREASON

AND LAST NAME> at risk of unknown persons using this information for solicitation or exploitation.

THE LAW:

The British North American Act now known as 'at law' as the Canada/Constitution Act, 1867 to 1982 as amended to include the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, remains a UK statute and has not yet been ratified to become Statute of Canada. Section 1, 7 and 24 of the Charter are inconsistent with the preamble and section 91 of the Constitution Act because they allow a violation of civil liberties that are protected under these sections. And the constitution of Canada is based on the supremacy of God who accords human rights and fundamental freedoms, and the Charter undermines this in section 1 by indicating our rights and freedoms come from the Charter; "guarantees rights and freedoms set out in it", i.e. rights are issued by the government. Under section 1 of the Charter the government can violate our rights without first going through Parliament or the court. Therefore, these sections of the Charter are unconstitutional and therefore have no force or effect of law under section 52.

This supreme law of Canada in the preamble states: *"WHEREAS the Provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have expressed their Desire to be federally united into One Dominion under the Crown of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, with a Constitution similar in Principle to that of the United Kingdom"*. Based on this preamble the Supreme Court of Canada decided in 1938 case law, The Bank Taxation Act; The Credit of Alberta Regulation Act; and the Accurate News and Information Act, SCC, that Canada has an implied bill of rights and that civil liberties is a matter of Federal jurisdiction and the provinces do not have the power to pass law that undermines civil liberties.

This supreme law includes protection of civil liberties also under section 91. In section 91 it designates civil liberties as exclusive, federal jurisdiction because it is not designated to the provinces. Section 92.13 which designates all provincial authority only states civil rights, not civil liberties. Therefore, civil liberties codified in the implied bill of rights and the Canadian Bill of Rights are federal jurisdiction and have constitutional authority under the preamble and section 91.

The Canadian Bill of Rights recognizes that our rights come from God. *"An Act in Recognition and Protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms"*. And in the full content of the Bill, unlike the Charter it does not claim rights come from the state.

Canadian Bill of Rights Preamble states; *"The Parliament of Canada, affirming that the Canadian Nation is founded upon principles that acknowledge the supremacy of God, the dignity and worth of the human person and the position of the family in a society of free men and free institutions.*

Affirming also that men and institutions remain free only when freedom is founded upon respect for moral and spiritual values and the rule of law;

And being desirous of enshrining these principles and the human rights and fundamental freedoms derived from them, in a Bill of Rights which shall reflect the respect of Parliament for its constitutional authority, and which shall ensure the protection of these rights and freedoms in Canada:"

Therefore, this notice of liability does not rely on the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, it relies on the supremacy of God enshrined in the Canadian Bill of Rights which has constitutional authority from the preamble and section 91 of the Constitution of Canada and common law.

1. **Canadian Bill of Rights:**

Section 1(a) the right of the individual to life, liberty, security of the person and enjoyment of property, and the right not to be deprived thereof except by due process of law.

<https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-12.3/page-1.html>

NOTICE OF LIABILITY FOR THE ACT OF TREASON

2. **Criminal Code of Canada:**

Section: 46 Treason

(2) Every one commits treason who, in Canada,

(a) uses force or violence for the purpose of overthrowing the government of Canada or a province;

(b) without lawful authority, communicates or makes available to an agent of a state other than Canada, military or scientific information or any sketch, plan, model, article, note or document of a military or scientific character that he knows or ought to know may be used by that state for a purpose prejudicial to the safety or defence of Canada;

(e) conspires with any person to do anything mentioned in paragraph (b) or forms an intention to do anything mentioned in paragraph (b) and manifests that intention by an overt act.

<https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-46/section-264.1.html>

3. **Common Law Precedent:**

Authorson v. Canada (Attorney General), 2000 ON SC:

Summary: This case law shows breach of fiduciary duty by public official is a tort if rights under Canadian Bill of Rights are violated.

<https://www.canlii.org/en/on/onsc/doc/2000/2000canlii22731/2000canlii22731.html?searchUrlHash=AAAAQAQIkJpbGwgb2YgUmlnaHRzIlgAAAAAB&resultIndex=2>

Implied Bill of Rights: The Bank Taxation Act; The Credit of Alberta Regulation Act; and the Accurate News and Information Act, 1938, SCC:

The Credit of Alberta Regulation Act; and the Accurate News and Information Act, SCR 100,1938

Summary: The Supreme Court of Canada ruled on the Reference re Alberta Statutes that restricted the media from criticizing the government. It found that the Accurate News and Information Act, along with the others submitted to it for evaluation, was ultra vires (beyond the powers of) the Alberta government. In the case of the Accurate News and Information Act, the court found that the Canadian constitution included an "implied bill of rights" that protected freedom of speech as being critical to a parliamentary democracy.

<https://www.canlii.org/en/ca/scc/doc/1938/1938canlii1/1938canlii1.html>

Jones v Tsige, 2012, ONCA:

Summary: The Ontario Court of Appeal declared that the common law in Canada recognizes a right to personal privacy, more specifically identified as a "tort of intrusion upon seclusion", as well as considering that appropriation of personality is already recognized as a tort in Ontario law. Meaning that one can sue for breach of privacy.

<https://www.canlii.org/en/on/onca/doc/2012/2012onca32/2012onca32.html>

Roncarelli v Duplessis, 1959, SCC:

Summary: Acting in excess of law creates personal liability.

... every official, from the Prime Minister down to a constable or a collector of taxes, is under the same responsibility for every act done without legal justification as any other citizen. The Reports abound with cases in which officials have been brought before the courts, and made, in their personal capacity, liable to punishment, or to the payment of damages, for acts done in their official character but in excess of their lawful authority. A colonial governor, a secretary of state, a military officer, and all subordinates, though carrying out the commands of their official superiors, are as responsible for any act which the law does not authorize as is any private and unofficial person."

<https://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/2751/index.do>

R. v. Eldorado Nuclear Ltd.; R. v. Uranium Canada Ltd, 1983, Supreme Court of Canada. 1985, SCC:

Summary: When a Crown agent acts outside of Crown purposes, and not on behalf of the state, there is no immunity of the Crown agent:

NOTICE OF LIABILITY FOR THE ACT OF TREASON

“The conclusion that a Crown agent is personally responsible for an unlawful act still leaves the question whether an act is unlawful. Where the unlawfulness or the wrongfulness of the act arises without any recourse to a statute, the Crown’s immunity from a statute, as expressed in s. 16 of the Interpretations Act, is irrelevant. If, for example, the agent commits a tortious act, it is the common law which characterizes it as unlawful. There is no immunity that the agent can claim.”

“Where the only source of unlawfulness is a statute, however, the analysis is entirely different...the preliminary question...is whether that person is bound by that statute...”

“When the agent steps outside the ambit of Crown purposes, however, it acts personally, and not on behalf of the state, and cannot claim to be immune as an agent of the Crown. This follows from the fact that s.16 of the Interpretations Act works for the benefit of the state, not for the benefit of the agent personally.”

The Court adopted this approach in the CBC v. The Queen 1983

“For all purposes of this Act...” the corporation “was not acting for the purposes entrusted to it under the Act... when the Corporation exercises its powers with a view to carrying out the purposes ...it acts as agent of Her Majesty and only as agent of Her Majesty. But, when it exercises its powers in a manner inconsistent with the purposes of the Act, it steps outside its agency role.

“The position at common law is not that those under de jure control are entitled to Crown immunity, but rather that immunity extends to those acting on behalf of the Crown.”

“This Court’s decision in Formea Chemicals Ltd. v. Polymer Corporation Ltd., supra, is also instructive. The case concerned s. 19 of the Patent Act, R.S.C. 1952, c. 203....

Martland J., speaking for the Court, equated “Government of Canada” with the Crown.

<https://decisions.scc-csc.ca/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/2486/index.do>

RECTIFICATION:

If **<FIRST AND LAST NAME OF PERPETRATOR>** immediately ceases and desists the unlawful conspiracy with foreign bodies to undermine the human rights and fundamental freedoms of **<YOUR FIRST AND LAST NAME>** i.e., the sovereignty of **<YOUR FIRST AND LAST NAME>** within 7 business days, this matter will be considered resolved.

FAILURE TO RECTIFY WILL RESULT IN 7 DAYS:

<YOUR FIRST LAST NAME> hereby gives notice if rectification as described above is not established after the allotted time, **<YOUR FIRST LAST NAME>** will pursue compensation in the amount of:

1. \$5,000.00 for the tort of treason
2. \$5,000.00 the violation of privacy

TOTAL CLAIM = \$10,000

As well, **<YOUR FIRST LAST NAME>** will seek a federal court order to remedy this ongoing violation of the rights including the right to privacy, and criminal violations by **<FIRST AND LAST NAME OF PERPETRATOR>**.

Signature: _____

Date: _____