

HUMAN RIGHTS TRIBUNAL OF ONTARIO

BETWEEN:

KEVIN ALEXANDER MCLEAN

APPLICANT

AND:

TORONTO POLICE SERVICES BOARD, ANTHONY ROMANO, MICHAEL KOLANKOWSKI, SEAN CASSIDY, GOLDVIEW PROPERTY MANAGEMENT LTD., LATOYA FERGUSON, AND APHRODITE ARTOPOULO

DECLARATION #11 OF THE APPLICANT

I, Mr. Kevin A. McLean (he/him), disabled, of Toronto, Ontario, declare the following under the penalty of perjury and knowing any statement here that is a false statement to be an offence:

1. I declare the following facts to be true. I declare the following facts to be true, for no improper purpose and for purposes herein. Where I have declared information on belief, I have cited the source of my belief.
2. I have made a slight change to the above noted style of cause consistent with the information that I provided the HRTO before it could fully process my HRTO Application and send the same to the Respondents.
3. This declaration, identified as Declaration #11, serves to confirm that all known interested parties have been duly served. Attached hereto and marked **as Exhibit "A"** is a compilation of all email correspondence pertaining to the service of my Rule 23 Motion, presented in sequential order. I hereby adopt the factual content of these emails as evidence within this Human Rights Tribunal of Ontario proceeding. This adoption includes my belief that the individual depicted standing by the east corridor doors on October 25, 2024, at approximately 1:11 p.m.—a female with Brunette hair wearing long pants and a **tunic**—is Mrs. Aphrodite Artopoulos. This identification is based on my prior observations of the aforementioned individual wearing the same or a similar outfit with a tunic of similar style, pattern and length. I respectfully request that Mrs. Artopoulos provide evidence to the contrary, should she dispute this identification of her and particulars regarding the same.
4. My belief that Mrs. Aphrodite Artopoulosⁱ is the individual shown in the images provided in my previous declarations is based on, but not limited to, the following:
 - a. The aforementioned evidence and the previously submitted pictorial evidence;

- b. Mrs. Artopoulos' statement to me shortly after the motor vehicle accident, the substance of which was a suggestion to cease pursuing the matter, stating there was no need for further action
- c. Statements made directly to me and in text messages to Ms. Nicole Artopoulos by Mrs. Artopoulos, wherein it was suggested that I had improperly benefited from or exceeded the allowable gains under the *Statutory Accident Benefits Schedule* (SABS) related to the insurance policy for the vehicle involved in the rear-end collision;
 - i. She was incorrect in her assertions and she was speaking, in my view, from a place of fear and a 'guilty conscience';
- d. Mrs. Artopoulos' statement to me, upon my provision of MRI information, to the effect of expressing a lack of prior awareness regarding the extent of my injuries;
- e. Statements made to me by Ms. Nicole Artopoulos (who is not a party to this proceeding) in the Spring of 2024, including an emotional declaration conveying remorse for "horrible things" done to me and an inability to reconcile with these actions;
- f. Mrs. Artopoulos' anger towards me for filing the HRTO Application and serving her via registered mail on October 24, 2024;
- g. Mrs. Artopoulos' dismay at my ability to overcome, despite my disabilities, her onslaught of adverse treatment at the time;
- h. Mrs. Artopoulos' anger and emotional instability (or as her daughter said, 'her intolerance for litigation as she 'freaks out' when she cannot control everything') about my drawing to the attention of the LTB that her terminated counsel's filing of unknown and unserved documents on October 24, 2024, that there was no consent to LTB portal service and any such request for alternative service was not made in accordance with the underlying statute, associated regulations and rules;
- i. Mrs. Artopoulos', in my view, delusional and irrational along with unsubstantiated and unparticularized allegation on August 9 and 20, 2024, in a filed document with the LTB that I had engaged in 'theft' and 'substance abuse';
 - i. In relation to that dishonest and false allegation, I note that my belief, which I challenge her to dispute with sworn or declared evidence, is that she was engaged in theft of my prescription medication which CAMH has her contact information, identity et al to address the same by report to the OOCS et al;
- j. Mrs. Artopoulos' outbursts in tribunal hearings over and above her counsel that required her to be restrained by tribunal directions;
- k. Repeated inquiries from Ms. Nicole Artopoulos, subsequent to conversations with her mother (Mrs. Aphrodite Artopoulos), concerning the avoidance of pursuing action against Mr. Andrew Papadimitropoulos (her ex-husband) and assertions of his non-involvement for various reasons; and
- l. Mrs. Artopoulos' unsupported assertions that "TD Insurance would not be involved in illegality" and that the "car accident could not have been intentional."

5. With regard to paragraph 4(g), evidence has been presented demonstrating the involvement of an Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) specialist, acting on behalf of TDI Group, in unlawful activities. Concerning the paragraph 4(f), unequivocal and undisputed evidence has been presented in other formal proceedings proving his involvement and his subsequent termination from the TDI Group. I take no pride in the latter but his misconduct was broad and far reaching, and had to be brought to the attention of the executive leadership of the TDI Group.

6. It is my belief that one of the "horrible things" to which Ms. Nicole Artopoulos alluded was her knowledge of the car accident being intentional and a potential collaboration between her mother,

independently or with others, and individuals at TD Insurance—as I have alleged occurred on October 25, 2024—to engage in adverse treatment towards me due to my disabilities (as previously defined). While I possess further evidence regarding the potential involvement of other parties, this declaration will be limited to the urgent matters pertaining to my Rule 23 Motion. I find no satisfaction in the validation of my previous predictions. I hereby formally request, through counsel for Mrs. Artopoulos, the immediate return of any property of mine that she possesses without authorization, to be held in trust by her counsel on my behalf.

7. To confirm the need for seeking various records in the orders sought, I note that the likes of arrest warrants are not necessarily filed with the court or the **originating court** which courthouse and court level that may have been. However, I do note from public Ontario government sources that arrest warrants are available after the individual has been arrested. However, I note infra that arrest warrants may or may not be filed with the originating court at issue (i.e. I was arrested, albeit I say on false and unlawful grounds predicated on the False Pretense Email, Fictitious DC Kolankowski Warning and the Fictitious Arrest Warrant, on October 2, 2024).
8. While the underlying facts involving the False Arrest Warrant have somewhat changed, I remain of the view that my definition of False Arrest Warrant is true, correct and accurate.
9. I am not aware of the Brampton Courthouse, either the ONSC or ONCJ, being the ‘originating courthouse’.
10. I do not believe that there is any provision under the *Criminal Code* that would have authorized the TPS and presiding justice to engage in a
11. In this regard, I now copy and paste the following from the Ontario government website:ⁱⁱ

“2.2.2 Pre-Enquête documents and recordings

Intake is presided over by a justice of the peace and is a forum for the police and individuals to bring Informations before a justice of the peace in order to lay criminal charges.

The justice of the peace may conduct a pre-Enquête hearing to determine whether legal process should issue (meaning, whether an Information is sworn and then whether to issue process by way of a summons or warrant).

Pre-Enquête hearings are not open to the public.

If process is issued

For both private and Crown prosecutions, if process is issued, the documents of the pre- Enquête hearing become publicly accessible once the defendant has been arrested or the summons has been served, unless there are legislative restrictions to access (for example, the YCJA) or a court order restricts access.

If process is not issued

If process is not issued, the documents and tapes of the pre-Enquête hearing are not publicly accessible

2.2.5

Arrest warrants (warrants in the first instance and bench warrants)

Warrants of arrest (also known as Warrants in the First Instance) may or may not be filed with the court. Practices for filing warrants of arrest vary depending on the police service. If a warrant of arrest or copy of a warrant of arrest is in the court file, it is only publicly accessible after the accused has been arrested or has received a summons, provided no other public access restrictions apply (for example, the YCJA). “

12. I also note that the likes of records associated with pre-enquête hearings are available after an individual has been arrested.
13. To re-encapsulate the potential I alluded to in my Declaration #10, it may be that no process was issued and the Intake Court Endorsement was created ab initio with forgery and false documentation. I believe that potential motive was to cover-up the potential adverse treatment that I received on October 2, 2024, in an effort to purportedly sanitize their [TPS, TPS 14th Division, and TPS Individual Respondents] conduct.
14. In the alternative, it may be that that the TPS or Crown (MAG) recreated the Purported Rojas Information and the Intake Court Endorsement in an effort to cover-up, mask or hide the name of the actual justice who approved or denied the process sought.
15. Whatever that document titled “**Intake Court Endorsement**” is or was, it is not an arrest warrant in a Form 7 as it is not in the required form and the ten requirements that I have identified from the Form 7 under the *Criminal Code*.
16. I also note the following from the following websiteⁱⁱⁱ which is reproduced:

“Court records (family, criminal, civil, divisional [sic], etc.)

No

Ministry of the Attorney General

Court records, if they exist, are under the custody and control of the Superior Court of Justice, and/or the Ontario Court of Justice, and/or the Court of Appeal for Ontario. Courts are not governed by *FIPPA* and court records under the supervisory control of the judiciary are not available through the FOI process or subject to *FIPPA*. Requests for court records should be made to the originating courthouse. More information is available in the [Ministry of the Attorney General's Court Services Division Policies and Procedures on Public Access to Court Files, Documents and Exhibits. Contact information for courthouses in Ontario](#)”

17. I note the language of 'originating courthouse'. I further note that JP Jiri is assigned to the Brampton courthouse in the ONCJ.
18. I note that custody and control are different in legal interpretation.
19. I believe control, as per decisions of the OIPC, ONSC, ONCA and SCC, includes the right to make the lawful demand to obtain the same. By way of example, I rely on the 1999 ONCA decision involving the Criminal Review Board of Ontario which involved the issue of whether backup tapes of stenographers, independently contracted or otherwise, were within the control of that administrative tribunal.
20. I note that the Brampton Courthouse is not the same as the ONCJ 10 Armoury Road.
21. I note that the TPS does not have jurisdiction in Brampton, Ontario.
22. I believe that the Peel Regional Police Force has jurisdiction over the city of Brampton in the Province of Ontario.
23. I demand to know from those who know what the originating courthouse was. For example, even if were the ONSC, then I demand to know which ONSC courthouse (i.e. 393 University Avenue, 361 University Avenue, 330 University Avenue in Toronto, Ontario, or the Divisional Court of the ONSC at 130 Queen Street West, or the Brampton Courthouse (ONSC)).
24. Without the 'originating courthouse', I cannot make a request, which is not preconditioned by a *FIPPA* request or subject to FOI, of said courthouse.
25. I believe that the 'originating courthouse', whichever courthouse that may be, is required to answer my requests and provide me as a party to the criminal proceeding with a copy of the requested records.
26. My reasoning for serving the various levels of court (Ontario) inclusive of the attention to the various individuals (see: Exhibit "A") was to ensure that they could direct me to the correct court level and courthouse. I again rely upon the definition of justice and 'judicial officer' in the *Criminal Code* and that any 'justice or 'judicial officer' could issue the process of an arrest warrant, summons or appearance notice and that said justice may be any of the following:
 - a. 'justice of the peace' who I believe would be a justice in an ONCJ (a "JP" or "ONCJ JP");
 - b. Justice of the Ontario Court of Justice (a "Provincial Court Justice");
 - c. Justice of the Ontario Superior Court of Justice (a "ONC Justice" or "Superior Court Justice");
 - and
 - d. a justice of the Ontario Court of Appeal (an "ONCA Justice").
27. I note that I never received a copy of an appearance notice pursuant to section 497 of the *Criminal Code*.
28. I note that I never received a summons from any peace officer or public officer as those terms are defined under the *Criminal Code*.

29. I note that under the Rules of Civil Procedure (Ontario regulation) (“ROCP”) that associate justices are precluded from hearing certain applications or motions. However, I do not believe that ROCP are relevant herein.
30. I note the distinction between ‘making’ or any permutation of said word and ‘laying’ or any permutation of said word with respect to an affidavit or declaration.
31. Like this declaration, I do not believe that a declaration is *per se* witnessed by a commissioner for taking oaths, a notary, a licensee (paralegal or lawyer) or a judicial officer, like a JP.
32. I believe that the making of the declaration is the act of finalizing it with a signature: (i) handwritten; (ii) electronic; or (ii) digital signature.
33. I believe the laying of an information includes the act of bringing it before a ‘justice’ or ‘judicial officer’.
34. I note the language in section 506 of the *Criminal Code* which is reproduced:

“**506** An information laid under [section 504](#) or [505](#) may be in Form 2.”

35. I again note that section 505 is not applicable to the facts of the alleged adverse treatment that I received at the hands, literally, of the TPS and TPS Respondents which the former includes Court Officer Frugoni-Rojas.
36. I note that the Form 2 of Purported Rojas Information has a reference to the section 508.1(2) of the *Criminal Code* which is not present in the Form 2 listed under the *Criminal Code*.
37. In relation to telewarrants, as apparently relied upon in the Purported Rojas Information by reference to a *Criminal Code* section 508.1(2), I note that section 487.1 of the *Criminal Code* does not allow for such telewarrants involved in “arrest warrants”.
38. I note that section 504 is titled by general heading and specific headings as follows:

“Information, Summons and Warrant
In what cases justice may receive information

39. I note that section 504 states the following:

“**504** Any one who, on reasonable grounds, believes that a person has committed an indictable offence may lay an information in writing and under oath before a justice, and the justice shall receive the information, where it is alleged

- **(a)** that the person has committed, anywhere, an indictable offence that may be tried in the province in which the justice resides, and that the person
 - **(i)** is or is believed to be, or
 - **(ii)** resides or is believed to reside,

within the territorial jurisdiction of the justice;

- **(b)** that the person, wherever he may be, has committed an indictable offence within the territorial jurisdiction of the justice;
- **(c)** that the person has, anywhere, unlawfully received property that was unlawfully obtained within the territorial jurisdiction of the justice; or
- **(d)** that the person has in his possession stolen property within the territorial jurisdiction of the justice.

40. It is not clear to me at this stage whether Mrs. Artopoulos, a Respondent herein, unlawfully received any of the property stolen by Mr. Karat of TDI.
41. I believe that whomever the person was who apparently laid the Form 2 Purported Rojas Information was required to do so **before** a justice and presumptively in writing.
42. I note that a justice is required to receive the “Information”. I am seeking records relating to that ‘receipt of Information’ (if any), which “Justice” it was (if any), and which courthouse it was received rendering that courthouse the ‘Originating Courthouse’.
43. I note that section 508.1 of the *Criminal Code* allows “any one” to lay an “Information” by means otherwise than “in person”.

“Information laid otherwise than in person

- **508.1 (1)** For the purposes of [sections 504](#) to [508](#), a peace officer may lay an information by any means of telecommunication that produces a writing.

- **Alternative to oath**

(2) A peace officer who uses a means of telecommunication referred to in subsection (1) shall, instead of swearing an oath, make a statement in writing stating that all matters contained in the information are true to the officer’s knowledge and belief, and such a statement is deemed to be a statement made under oath.”

44. I am requesting and demanding generally and specifically through the HRT0 Proceeding processes, that if telecommunication was utilized that whatever writing was produced at the time is produced volitionally or, in the alternative, by the HRT0 pursuant to the provincial statute that is paramount to any other statutes that conflict with it.
45. I note the word ‘telecommunication’ is subsumed under the definitions of “teleconference” and “audioconference” under the *Criminal Code*.
46. I am requesting generally and specifically in the HRT0 Proceeding processes, access to that which produced a writing and evidence of the same.

47. I note that none of the provisions under section 487.1(1) of the *Criminal Code* involve an ‘arrest warrant’.
48. Ergo, I do not believe that any of the exceptions to having the teleconference produce a writing applied to whatever occurred (if anything) between the Purported Rojas Information and the unknown justice at the unknown courthouse.
49. I do not believe that there is any provision under the Criminal Code that authorizes any justice or judicial officer to not sign and endorse a Form 7 (Arrest Warrant) and/or to have an Intake Court Endorsement in the format that Ms. Anguelova provided herein to masquerade as an ‘arrest warrant’.
50. I believe that if JP Jiri was the actual judicial officer who approved the Intake Court Endorsement, then he would have returned the Intake Court Endorsement to the ‘applicant’ (whomever that may have been which I requested records regarding the same) in an executed form either by signature, electronic signature or digital signature.
51. I note that Court Officer Frugoni-Rojas appears to have relied on subsection 508.1(2) of the *Criminal Code*.
52. I note that no *FIPPA* request is required of my request of each courthouse and level of court whereby court records, if they are in the custody and/or control of one of the originating courthouses of the ONCJ or ONSC. Therefore, I believe I am entitled to the court records, which by my reading, would include all records after the commencement of the proceeding (criminal). I believe that the Form 2 commenced the proceeding. I demand a copy of the original of the Purported Rojas Information. I demand a copy of the underlying application documents inclusive of all records that were exchanged between the TPS and the originating courthouse along with its justice that involve myself and/or related to myself whether it includes information about other persons (see: for example by analogy, interpretation of “Personal Information” by the OPCC in its guidance documents).
53. I note that the MAG and the courts are separate branches of government but the former is subject to *FIPPA*.
54. I note that the court staff of various Ontario courts are in fact employed under the Public Services Act and are part of a collective bargaining agreement between said unit and The Crown In Right of Ontario. I note that makes said individuals separate from the judiciary.
55. I further note that “court records”, which I presume have a similar meaning to that of adjudicative records” as interpreted in *Toronto Star v. AGO* (2018 ONSC as per The Honourable Justice Morgan) may or may not involve the purported arrest warrant.
56. I believe the this is a full answer to Ms. Anguelova’s comment about what she obtained was in the court file. I believe pursuant to Ms. Anguelova’s obligations as counsel and that of the TPS that they distinct and concomitant obligations that required more in the Response as it related to the listing and attaching of key documents wherever they were so located. I note that the obtaining of documents from the court file, if that was the case, was, in my view, more arduous than obtaining documents from her clients. I again note the Police File ID on the Intake Court Endorsement. I query why the Intake Court Endorsement would contain a police file identification yet the Form 10 did not. Moreover, I query why the Intake Court Endorsement would contain a police file identification but

not the requirements of a Form 7 including the location of the justice who would have been required to execute or endorse the same. I stand by my belief that the Intake Court Endorsement is a false document and it was uttered by persons unknown to me. I am not suggesting or implying that Ms. Anguelova was involving in intentional uttering of a false document.

57. I thank Ms. Anguelova for confirming that which she obtained in the court file in light of how the theft (adverse treatment) has affected my abilities otherwise.
58. I also believe that whatever originating courthouse received any laid information and application for an arrest warrant (if any) would have records therein of the application and Information.
59. I confirm that Detective Rizwan Mohammed asked me to communicate through him regarding Court Officer Frugoni-Rojas as opposed to directly serving her. I did so out of courtesy and to maintain cordial and professional relations.
60. I believe that all of the above were treatment that I received from some or all of the Respondents that amounted to adverse treatment of which I was treated differently than other individuals similarly situated in Ontario.
61. I rely on the following in that I am entitled to be treated equal under the *HR Code*:

“Services

1 Every person has a right to **equal treatment** with respect to services, goods and facilities, without discrimination because of race, ancestry, place of origin, colour, ethnic origin, citizenship, creed, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, age, marital status, family status or disability. R.S.O. 1990, c. H.19, s. 1; 1999, c. 6, s. 28 (1); [2001, c. 32, s. 27 \(1\)](#); [2005, c. 5, s. 32 \(1\)](#); [2012, c. 7, s. 1](#).

Accommodation

2 (1) Every person has a right to **equal treatment** with respect to the occupancy of accommodation, without discrimination because of race, ancestry, place of origin, colour, ethnic origin, citizenship, creed, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, age, marital status, family status, disability or the receipt of public assistance. R.S.O. 1990, c. H.19, s. 2 (1); 1999, c. 6, s. 28 (2); [2001, c. 32, s. 27 \(1\)](#); [2005, c. 5, s. 32 \(2\)](#); [2012, c. 7, s. 2 \(1\)](#)”

62. I believe by my computation that there are 252 court locations or courthouse in Ontario with 200 being in the ONCJ and 52 with the ONSC.
63. I believe that there are eight judicial regions of which the Divisional Court hears matters before it and that the Brampton Courthouse has an ONSC within it and hears Divisional Court matters at various times in the year.
64. I put the Respondents to strict proof herein and respectfully challenge them to provide any evidence to the contrary to the above.

65. To the extent someone has impersonated JP Jiri, he has my empathy for being so involved in the same. I hope he and the ONCJ, including the ONCJ Chief Justice and ACJ and JOP Coordinator realize that I have the right and, to some extent the obligation, to search for the truth in order to advance my HRTO Application in this HRTO Proceeding. I will continue to exhaust all avenues available to me.
66. I solemnly declare the foregoing to be true as of May 30, 2025, and for no improper purpose. This document has been digitally signed using Adobe, Inc., which I note differs from the purported digital signature on behalf of JP Jiri. I maintain my position that JP Jiri did not digitally sign the **Intake Court Endorsement**.



Digitally signed by Kevin A. McLean
Date: 2025.05.30 19:36:49 -04'00'
Adobe Acrobat version: 2025.001.20474

Mr. Kevin A. McLean (B.A., J.D., CIM)

DOB: March 25, 1983

Fixed address: 410-775 King Street, Toronto, Ontario, M5V 2K3

ⁱI can confirm that the female individual observed by the East corridor of 1025 Queen Street West on October 25, 2024, is Mrs. Aphrodite Artopoulos, born on August 8, 1957. Her residential address is 64 Roosevelt Road, East York, Toronto, Ontario, M4J 4T7. Originally from Greece, she has resided in Canada since her teenage years and worked primarily as a professor at Seneca College until her retirement around 2019. Notably, she was wearing a distinctive three-quarter length, button-front tunic, a traditional Greek garment which I have seen her wear previously. Mrs. Artopoulos is the mother of my former common-law spouse, Ms. Nicole Artopoulos, and also serves as the landlord of my current fixed address

ⁱⁱ<https://www.ontario.ca/document/access-court-files-documents-and-exhibits/section-2-public-access-criminal-court-files-and-documents>

ⁱⁱⁱ<https://www.ontario.ca/page/freedom-information-request>

Exhibit “A”



Kevin McLean <mrkevinaalexandermcleanbajdcim@gmail.com>

CONFIDENTIAL: Request of the Chief Justice of ONSC and Regional Senior Justice of the ONSC (Toronto Region) for administrative records on or around September 23, 2024

Kevin McLean <mrkevinaalexandermcleanbajdcim@gmail.com>

Wed, May 28, 2025 at 9:38 PM

To: "SCJ Correspondence (JUD)" <SCJ-CSJ.Correspondence@ontario.ca>

May 28, 2025

CONFIDENTIAL: EXCLUSIVELY FOR PURPOSES HEREIN IN RELATION TO THE HRTO PROCEEDING (defined infra).

VIA EMAIL

TO:

Ontario Superior Court of Justice

Office of the Chief Justice
361 University Ave. Toronto, Ontario M5G 1T3

Office of the Associate Chief Justice
361 University Ave. Toronto, Ontario M5G 1T3

Office of the Regional Senior Justice
361 University Ave. Toronto, Ontario M5G 1T3

TO BE FORWARDED TO OR DIRECTED TO OR TO THE LEGAL COUNSEL FOR THE ONSC FOR RELIEF SOUGHT IN THE MOTION PACKAGE:

Kind attention: Chief Justice of the ONSC

The Honourable Chief Justice Mr. Morawetz

Kind attention: Associate Chief Justice of the ONSC
The Honourable Faye E. McWatt

Kind attention: Regional Senior Justice of the ONSC
The Honourable Stephen E. Firestone
Regional Senior Judge for the Toronto Region

Tribunal file number: HRTO 2024-58615-I (the "**HRTO Proceeding**")

Type of document: Email with attachment

Short title of proceeding: *McLean v. Goldview, Artopoulos, TPS et al*

Party: Applicant (Mr. Kevin A. McLean (B.A., J.D., CIM))

Re: My Section 16.1 of the SPPA and Rule 23 Motion: (i) Motion Form; (ii) Declaration #10 in support (reliance on all previous declarations filed and served); and (iii) Motion Submissions (“Motion Package”).

Dear Sirs/Mesdames/Other Gender-Neutral Pronouns:

1. Please find attached notification of my Motion Package to the Ontario Superior Court of Justice, inclusive of its Divisional Court, to ensure the court is duly served.
2. While I appreciate the contents of your previous email, I must respectfully express my disagreement. I have carefully reviewed your comments regarding communications with the Court. My search of the Ontario Rules of Civil Procedure yielded the rule below as the most pertinent; however, I wish to highlight that the present matter does not fall under the purview of civil proceedings governed by these rules. Furthermore, my Human Rights Tribunal of Ontario proceeding is a matter for a statutory tribunal, distinct from the Ontario Superior Court of Justice or its Divisional Court.
3. In any event, the aforementioned rule is the below:

“Communications out of Court

1.09 When a proceeding is pending before the court, no party to the proceeding and no party’s lawyer shall communicate about the proceeding with a judge or associate judge out of court, directly or indirectly, unless,

- (a) all the parties consent, in advance, to the out-of-court communication; or
- (b) the court directs otherwise. O. Reg. 132/04, s. 2; O. Reg. 438/08, s. 66; O. Reg. 711/20, s. 2; O. Reg. 383/21, s. 15.”

4. Regarding the aforementioned rule, my understanding is that if the analogy were applicable, a party involved in the proceeding, which is distinct from both the criminal proceeding and this HRTTO Proceeding, could not be categorized as ‘the proceeding’ itself. Consequently, any related communications would not pertain to ‘the proceeding’. Furthermore, I considered these communications to be a form of notification and information gathering, rather than being ‘out of court’.
5. Thank you for pointing out that the criminal proceeding was indeed before the Ontario Court of Justice (ONCJ) and not the Ontario Superior Court of Justice (ONSC). Nevertheless, I maintain my view, as stated under oath, that it is legally improbable that Justice of the Peace (JP) Jiri, presiding in Brampton and not Toronto, could have received the relevant information for a matter before the ONCJ in downtown Toronto, especially given the unverified nature of the allegation in the purported Rojas Information (Form 2) and the absence of JP Jiri’s actual signature on what appears to be an ‘Intake Court Endorsement’ lacking a verifiable ‘digital signature’.
6. While it is correct that the matter is within the jurisdiction of the ONCJ and not the ONSC, I have carefully reviewed the entirety of the Criminal Code. My understanding is that a justice of any court level possesses the authority to endorse a summons, warrant, or other legal document. It is possible that in certain unique circumstances, a justice from a court level where the proceeding is not typically situated might still provide such an endorsement. However, this would not negate the fact that a justice did, in fact, approve a criminal charge or warrant. This instance may represent one such exceptional situation.

7. I say so, out of courtesy, that even if I look at the ONSC Criminal Rules of Proceedings, because that Intake Court Endorsement does not have a court level, I note the following:

Electronic Signatures 9.01 Where a signature is required, the Court will accept electronically signed documents that consist of electronic information identifying the signatory and the date and place of signing.

8. Moreover, even the ONCJ Criminal Rules use the following in relation to signatures:

Signatures on Electronic Documents

3.4 (1) Electronic documents, as defined in s. 841 of the *Criminal Code*, may be signed using an electronic signature, which is electronic information that a person creates or adopts in order to sign a document and that is in, attached to or associated with a document.

9. The word endorsed is scattered throughout the Criminal Proceedings Rules for the ONSC and it is trite that endorsed means “signed”. Of course, without a courthouse or court level identified in the “Intake Court Endorsement” with it clearly being a false document and a forged signature, I am entitled to take steps in the HRTO Proceeding to determine what were in fact documents sent in advance and received by a justice. Presuming that we are looking at some 93 justices in the ONSC (Toronto Region), 75 justices in ONCJ (Toronto Region), and 75 justices of the peace in the Toronto region, it is unfathomable that the TPS would have sought whatever they were seeking from a Brampton JP.

10. It appears that there is no way to seek the documents through a FIPPA request but I am still inquiring.

11. have invested considerable time in examining the nuances between administrative and adjudicative privilege, particularly as they pertain to the relief sought in my Motion Package. Given that my request does not involve compelling testimony from a justice directly, but rather pertains to records that may have been submitted to the Ontario Superior Court of Justice (ONSC) around late September or October 2024, it is my considered opinion that the public interest outweighs any privilege that may be asserted, however qualified

12. I would be grateful if the reviewing party could consider this perspective when determining whether the ONSC will consent, oppose, or take no position regarding the relief requested in my motion.

13. Should you wish to provide a formal response in accordance with the Human Rights Code, the email address for the HRTO Registrar is hrtto.registrar@ontario.ca. Kindly note the primacy of the Human Rights Code over other provincial statutes. Should the names of the counsel for Respondents be required, I would be pleased to provide them.

14. As I believe that this is a matter that both the Chief Justice of the ONSC, Associate Chief Justice and Regional Senior Justice of the ONSC, if I am correct in my reasonably grounded belief that a justice other than Justice Of the Peace Mr. Jiri received the Form 2 Purported Rojas Information, I will presume that this email will be forwarded to them for their review and consideration involving this non-adjudicative but administrative matter. If no records exist, I would be most grateful to know at the earliest knowledge of the same from whomever wishes to respond by way of counsel presumably. As such, I will respect the solemn and serious nature, along with its eccentricities albeit not created by myself, of the same and I await for a response or responses. For ease of reference and continuity, I confirm that I have served the ONCJ (Office of its Chief Justice, Associate Chief Justice and JOP Coordinator) with a copy of the same Motion Package.

15. Should anything be unclear, kindly have the relevant person inform me at their earliest convenience.

16. Thank you kindly.

[Quoted text hidden]

3 attachments



Submissions - Interim Interlocutory Orders - Applicant - Moving Party - Mr McLean -28-May-2025.pdf
591K



Motion - Interlocutory Orders - TPS - Applicant - McLean - 27-May-2025.pdf
793K



Declaration #10 - Applicant - Mr. McLean - Declared - May-28-2025.pdf
1777K



Kevin McLean <mrkevinalexandermcleanbajdcim@gmail.com>

HRTO 2024-58615-I: service of Motion Package upon Court Officer Ms. Frugoni-Rojas

1 message

Kevin McLean <mrkevinalexandermcleanbajdcim@gmail.com>

Thu, May 29, 2025 at 8:16 AM

To: Rizwan Mohamed <Rizwan.Mohamed@tps.ca>

May 29, 2025

CONFIDENTIAL

EXCLUSIVELY FOR PURPOSES HEREIN IN RELATION TO THE **HRTO PROCEEDING**

VIA EMAIL

TO:

Ms. Christyn Frugoni-Rojas
Court Officer
Toronto, Ontario

("Court Officer Frugoni-Rojas" or "Court Officer")

Care of Detective or Detective Constable Mr. Rizwan Mohammed^[i]
Via email: Rizwan.Mohamed@tps.ca

CONCERNING THE LITIGATION MATTER OF WITH THE FOLLOWING PARTICULARS:

Tribunal file number: HRTO 2024-58615-I (the "**HRTO Proceeding**")

Type of document: email with attachment(s)

Short title of proceeding: *McLean v. Goldview, Artopoulos, TPS et al*

Party: Applicant (Mr. Kevin A. McLean (B.A., J.D., CIM)

Role in Motion: *Moving Party*

Pursuant to: *HR Code; SPPA; HRTO Specific Rules; Legislation Act*; common law cited in the Motion Package

Specific procedural rule: HRTO Specific Rule 23 ("**Rule 23**")

Subject: My Section 16.1 of the *SPPA* and Rule 23 **Motion:** (i) Motion Form^[ii]; (ii) Declaration #10 in support (reliance on all previous declarations filed and served); and (iii) Motion Submissions ("**Motion Package**").

-

To Whom It May Concern:

1. I am writing to follow up on the matter referenced above.
2. Regarding Detective Mohammed's communication that Ms. Frugoni-Rojas does not wish to receive direct communication from me, I am extending the courtesy of serving her with the enclosed Motion

Package through Detective Mohammed, despite her being the declarant of the Purported Frugoni Rojas Information in the Form 2.

3. Please find attached the Motion Package for the purpose of notice and service upon Court Officer Rojas-Frugoni. Service upon the Court Officer is being effected as it is my understanding that her position may not yet fall under the purview of the Toronto Police Service (TPS) or the *Police Services Act* to the same extent as police constables and higher ranks. Furthermore, I believe, on reasonable grounds, she may possess evidence, records, documents, and/or information pertinent to the Human Rights Tribunal of Ontario (HRT) Proceeding, particularly my Rule 23 Motion. As evidenced by the documents filed yesterday, this motion arises from my belief that the "Intake Court Endorsement," purportedly an 'arrest warrant' based on Constable Romano's statement to me on the evening of October 2, 2024, following my attendance pursuant to what I refer to as the False Pretense Email and the subsequent DC Kolankowski Fictitious Warning Representation, is questionable. The alleged 'digital signature' of Justice of the Peace (JP) Jiri does not constitute a lawful digital signature and bears no resemblance to one. Consequently, it appears the Intake Court Endorsement was either newly created at an undetermined time, improperly altered, or affected by a clerical error resulting in the loss of the originally signed endorsement and a subsequent attempt at recreation.

4. Regardless of the circumstances, I maintain my entitlement to the underlying documents relevant to the HRT Proceeding, including a Notice of Constitutional Question (NOCQ). While I acknowledge that the Court Officer likely swore an affidavit, I have reason to believe that the copy I received is neither accurate nor authentic. Therefore, I respectfully request that the Court Officer provide an original copy to both myself and the HRT at her earliest convenience. Additionally, should she possess any other relevant evidence, I would appreciate her providing it to me, with a copy to the HRT, to potentially obviate the need for her or her representative to file a responsive form and affidavit evidence.

5. Should Ms. Frugoni-Rojas wish to provide her position and/or file any documents through you or legal counsel for the TPS, she is at liberty to do so. If you require Ms. Anguelova's contact information, her details are available in the Law Society of Ontario (LSO) directory. The email address I have for her is Rali.Anguelova@toronto.ca.

6. For the filing of non-pleading documents with the HRT, the appropriate email address for the Registrar is hrt.registrar@ontario.ca.

7. Concerning my property that was taken on October 25, 2024, at the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health (CAMH) (visitor area) (nota bene: I have never been a patient of CAMH contrary to the false and malicious comments that the Purported Complainant and Mrs. Artopoulos said about me) the individual involved has been identified as Mr. David Karat, an ADR Specialist with TD Automotive Insurance Group ("TDIA Group"). I have notified Mr. Karat and relevant entities within the TDIA Group including the CEO of the TDI Group (includes TD Life Insurance Company), as well as senior legal counsel at TD Bank Group, regarding the discovery of unredacted images related to this incident. The circumstances surrounding this matter have been detailed previously. Upon me providing the image of Mr. Karat from his LinkedIn and the unredacted CAMH images, they in fact blocked me after Ms. Johnson (managing counsel of TD Bank Group) posited that I had no credible evidence in April 2025.

8. As you are aware, Detective Abdulhameed K. Virani of the 52nd Division visited me at the 14th Division jail quadrant. The 52nd Division is geographically situated within the same district as the downtown Toronto courthouses. Given the duties of court officers in Toronto, the majority of these courthouses fall within the 52nd Division's jurisdiction.

9. The HRT and the Ontario Court of Justice courthouse at 10 Armoury Road are both located within the 52nd Division. However, JP Jiri was assigned to the Brampton courthouse in 2024, having previously served at the TPS 52nd Division.

10. Court Officer Frugoni-Rojas' Form 2 indicates a digital signature at 11:49 a.m. on September 23, 2024, while the purported digital signature of JP Jiri on the Intake Court Endorsement is time-stamped at 12:59 a.m. on the same date. Inquiries have revealed that the Brampton Courthouse did not commence its lunch break until 1:00 p.m. Given that Court Officer Frugoni-Rojas is reportedly based in Toronto and JP Jiri was presiding over court matters in Brampton on that day, the timeframe of less than 70 minutes for him to review the Form 2 and any accompanying warrant documents raises questions. Furthermore, the Intake Court Endorsement lacks an explicit endorsement. The apparent experience of officers like PC Romano and DC Kolankowski suggests they would have recognized that the Intake Court Endorsement did not constitute a valid arrest warrant. An alternative possibility is the existence of an arrest warrant issued by another justice, potentially one with a conflict of interest, with the Intake Court Endorsement being subsequently created by a different justice, also potentially conflicted, who did not wish to be identified by the time disclosure was prepared.

11. To ensure my ability to pursue appropriate remedies, including personal, public interest, and Charter-based relief, a clear understanding of the actual circumstances is necessary.

12. Therefore, I would appreciate it if the Court Officer would provide any relevant evidence, information, and records not later than seven days of receiving this communication. Alternatively, if she intends to take a different position, I request that this be communicated on her behalf within the same timeframe, so that the HRTO may have the benefit of this information in exercising its independent adjudicative function.

13. Please be advised that copies of these materials have been provided to both levels of the Ontario court (Superior Court of Justice and Court of Justice), as well as the Attorney General of Ontario and the Assistant Deputy Attorney General (Civil Law Division). The various respondents' counsel have also been served as well.

14. Based on emerging information, it is my reasonable belief that the individual observed by the door inside the CAMH building on the east side, facing TD Commons, is Mrs. Aphrodite Artopoulos. The physical description noted in the unredacted image aligns with Mrs. Artopoulos' characteristics. The connections between Seneca College alumni, including Court Officer Frugoni-Rojas, JP Jiri, and Mrs. Artopoulos' former legal counsel, Ms. Nikki Kanavas, are also notable, as is the prior affiliation of JP Jiri with the 52nd Division.

15. I can also confirm that Ms. Kanavas subsequently appeared for the Landlord in the Landlord and Tenant Board (LTB) Proceeding, disseminating information on behalf of the TPS on October 24, 2024. Given that Ms. Kanavas' office is located at 55 University Avenue, Toronto, Ontario, I surmise a potential connection with Court Officer Frugoni-Rojas.

16. The timing and connections above appear not to be coincidental but it leaves me with the uncontested belief that Toronto police officers and court officers in the 52nd Division would have attended right across the road to either 10 Armoury Road or 361 University Avenue, Toronto, Ontario.

17. I shall attend to the SOD for the Court Officer for the benefit of other parties and interested persons, and the HRTO.

18. We will find out soon enough if I am correct in that belief. Either way – important public issues to be addressed and I thank Court Officer Frugoni-Rojas for her attention to the same.

19. Have a blessed rest of your week.

Appendices

Appendix #1: JP Jiri

George Jiri

Justice of the Peace

Ontario Court of Justice

AboutAbout

Dad | Justice of the Peace | Former Police Officer | Volunteer Board Member | Committed to Integrity and Fairness.ActivityActivity

347

Loaded 3 Comments posts

George Jiri commented on a post • 1w1w

Congratulations John!

Congratulations John!

George Jiri commented on a post • 1mo1mo

Congrats Neso!

Congrats Neso!

George Jiri commented on a post • 9mo9mo

Congratulations on achieving this milestone! Wishing you continued success in all your future endeavours!

Congratulations on achieving this milestone! Wishing you continued success in all your future endeavours!

Show all comments

ExperienceExperience

Ontario Court of Justice logo

Justice of the Peace

Justice of the Peace

Ontario Court of JusticeOntario Court of Justice

Jan 2024 - Present · 1 yr 5 mosJan 2024 to Present · 1 yr 5 mos

Toronto Police Service logo

Toronto Police Service

Toronto Police Service

Permanent Full-time · 21 yrs 4 mosPermanent Full-time · 21 yrs 4 mos

Toronto, Ontario, CanadaToronto, Ontario, Canada

Detective Constable, Sex Crimes - Human Trafficking Enforcement Team

Detective Constable, Sex Crimes - Human Trafficking Enforcement Team

Feb 2021 - Jan 2024 · 3 yrsFeb 2021 to Jan 2024 · 3 yrs

As a member of the Human Trafficking Enforcement Team, I had a clear humanitarian responsibility to assist human trafficking victims in transitioning from crisis to self-sufficiency while also collaborating with internal and external partners to raise awareness and prevent human trafficking. I coordinated and assumed responsibility for investigations, as well as referred human trafficking victims to appropriate programs.

To reduce the risks associated with human trafficking investigations, I identified and assessed the likelihood of a potential risk becoming a reality and the risk's consequences. Victims of human trafficking require a variety of support services to meet their specific needs and aid in their recovery. I maintained strong working relationships with community partners and was aware of the importance of providing victims with proper care, identifying and assessing their risk, and doing everything possible to eliminate or reduce their risk of exploitation.

Comprehensive protection for trafficked persons entailed many aspects, with safety and separation from their trafficker being top priorities. I considered not only the existing level of risk to the victim's safety and welfare but also potential risks that might arise because of the police investigation. As a member of the Human Trafficking Enforcement Team, I had a clear humanitarian responsibility to assist human trafficking victims in transitioning from crisis to self-sufficiency while also collaborating with internal and external partners to raise awareness and prevent human trafficking. I coordinated and assumed responsibility for investigations, as well as referred human trafficking victims to appropriate programs. To reduce the risks associated with human trafficking investigations, I identified and assessed the likelihood of a potential risk becoming a reality and the risk's consequences. Victims of human trafficking require a variety of support services to meet their specific needs and aid in their recovery. I maintained strong working relationships with community partners and was aware of the importance of providing victims with proper care, identifying and assessing their risk, and doing everything possible to eliminate or reduce their risk of exploitation. Comprehensive protection for trafficked persons entailed many aspects, with safety and separation from their trafficker being top priorities. I considered not only the existing level of risk to the victim's safety and welfare but also potential risks that might arise because of the police investigation....see more

Surveillance, Public Speaking and +15 skills

Detective Constable, 52 Major Crime Unit

Detective Constable, 52 Major Crime Unit

Sep 2019 - Feb 2021 · 1 yr 6 mosSep 2019 to Feb 2021 · 1 yr 6 mos

Analyze and record situations in order to carry out duties firmly, thoughtfully, and neutrally while in charge of investigations involving break and enter, robbery, firearms, and drug distribution. Obtain judicial authorizations, conduct interviews, obtain statements, and deploy other criminal investigative techniques to gather evidence.

Provide long-term investigative processes with modern oversight, progress measurement mechanisms, and risk management to ensure the development of evidence-based, outcome-driven, and fiscally sound investigations for successful prosecution.

Ensure that case management, quality control, monitoring, and evaluation of work and deliverables are dependable, and that they are completed within the time and budget constraints specified.

[i] <https://sunshineliststats.com/Salary/rizwanmohamed/2023/9/cityoftorontopoliceservice>

[ii] Form 16 with the HRTO

--

My best regards to you,

Kevin A. McLean (B.A., J.D., CIM)

Chartered Investment Manager

E (personal and confidential): mrkevinalexandermcleanbajdcim@gmail.com

DISCLAIMER

1. *The content of this email is confidential and intended for the recipient specified in message only. It is strictly forbidden to share any part of this message with any third party, without a written consent of the sender. If you received this message by mistake, please reply to this message and follow with its deletion, so that we can ensure such a mistake does not occur in the future.*
2. *Due to being an accident, this email may be dictated in part or full with voice recognition software. Kindly excuse any errors for grammar, syntax or spelling.*

3 attachments



Submissions - Interim Interlocutory Orders - Applicant - Moving Party - Mr McLean -28-May-2025.pdf
591K



Motion - Interlocutory Orders - TPS - Applicant - McLean - 27-May-2025.pdf
793K



Declaration #10 - Applicant - Mr. McLean - Declared - May-28-2025.pdf
1777K



Mr. Kevin McLean <mcleansettlement@gmail.com>

Notice of Constitutional Questions – filed in HRTO proceeding - 2024-58615-I; kind update as to your position

3 messages

Mr. Kevin McLean <mcleansettlement@gmail.com>
To: NCQ-AQC.Toronto@justice.gc.ca

Fri, Feb 21, 2025 at 9:11 PM

VIA EMAIL

PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL

Tribunal file number: 2024-58615-I

Type of document: email

Short title of proceeding: *McLean v. TPSB et al*;

Party: Applicant

To:

Department of Justice Canada

120 Adelaide Street West

Suite #400

Toronto, Ontario M5H 1T1

Telephone: 416-973-0942; (Alternate: 647-256-1663)

TDD: 416-973-2496

Fax: 416-954-8982

Email for Notices of Constitutional Questions:

NCQ-AQC.Toronto@justice.gc.ca

Re: Notice of Constitutional Questions – filed in HRTO proceeding - 2024-58615-I; kind update as to your position

To Whom It May Concern:

1. I write regarding the above.
2. In November 2024, I hand delivered my notice of constitutional questions which is re-attached in electronic form. I was unaware that you had an email for delivery of the same.
3. In any event, I would be most grateful to know what position the AGC may be taking in the same.
4. Thank you.

Yours truly,

Mr. Kevin A. McLean (B.A. (MCL), J.D., CIM) (he/him)

(e): mcleansettlement@gmail.com

Disclaimer:

1. *The contents of this email are strictly confidential, unless otherwise noted, and are only intended for the recipients of said email.*
2. *If you receive this email in error, please reply to me by separate email and confirm the same by double deleting my errant email. I will do the same for you.*

Meegwetch | Merci | Thank you |



FILED_AR_McLean v. TPS et al_Motion Submissions_NOCQ and Expedited Proceedings_SERVED.pdf
1817K

Mr. Kevin McLean <mcleansettlement@gmail.com>
To: NCQ-AQC.Toronto@justice.gc.ca

Fri, Feb 28, 2025 at 12:21 PM

Dear Attorney General of Canada: would you kindly provide me with the name of assigned legal counsel for the above? In the interim, would you please provide the position of the AGC in relation to the above. The named Respondents therein are required to provide their Responses today to the HRT0. They were able to obtain an extension of time albeit in noncompliant form from late January 2025 to today's date. I would like to proceed with the setting of the hearing for the notice of constitutional questions and would be most grateful to know your position.
Thank you.

Yours truly,

Mr. Kevin A. McLean (B.A. (MCL), J.D., CIM) (he/him)

(e): mcleansettlement@gmail.com

Disclaimer:

1. *The contents of this email are strictly confidential, unless otherwise noted, and are only intended for the recipients of said email.*
2. *If you receive this email in error, please reply to me by separate email and confirm the same by double deleting my errant email. I will do the same for you.*

Meegwetch | Merci | Thank you |

[Quoted text hidden]

Mr. Kevin McLean <mcleansettlement@gmail.com>
To: NCQ-AQC.Toronto@justice.gc.ca

Wed, May 28, 2025 at 5:17 PM

May 28, 2025

EXCLUSIVELY FOR PURPOSES HEREIN

VIA EMAIL

TO:

Attorney General of Canada

Tribunal file number: HRTO 2024-58615-I (the “HRTO Proceeding”)

Type of document: Email with attachment

Short title of proceeding: *McLean v. Goldview, Artopoulos, TPS et al*

Party: Applicant (Mr. Kevin A. McLean (B.A., J.D., CIM))

Re: My Section 16.1 of the SPPA and Rule 23 Motion: (i) Motion Form; (ii) Declaration #10 in support (reliance on all previous declarations filed and served); and (iii) Motion Submissions (“Motion Package”)

-

Dear Sirs/Mesdames/Other Gender-Neutral Pronouns:

1. I am obliged to provide you with notice of my above Motion Package for service upon you so that you have notice and are entitled to provide whether you oppose and/or consent and/or provide a position to the relief sought.

I would be most grateful to know whether you have legal counsel involving the same so I can communicate with said individual.

2. Thank you kindly.

Yours truly,

Mr. Kevin A. McLean (B.A. (MCL), J.D., CIM) (he/him)

(e): mcleansettlement@gmail.com

Disclaimer:

1. *The contents of this email are strictly confidential, unless otherwise noted, and are only intended for the recipients of said email.*
2. *If you receive this email in error, please reply to me by separate email and confirm the same by double deleting my errant email. I will do the same for you.*

Meegwetch | Merci | Thank you |

[Quoted text hidden]

3 attachments



Declaration #10 - Applicant - Mr. McLean - Declared - May-28-2025.pdf
1777K



Motion - Interlocutory Orders - TPS - Applicant - McLean - 27-May-2025.pdf
793K



Submissions - Interim Interlocutory Orders - Applicant - Moving Party - Mr McLean -28-May-2025.pdf
591K



Mr. Kevin McLean <mcleansettlement@gmail.com>

PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL - HRT0 2024-58615-I: Motion Package of the Applicant for service and notice on the below

2 messages

Mr. Kevin McLean <mcleansettlement@gmail.com>
To: Brampton.OCJ.courts@ontario.ca

Wed, May 28, 2025 at 5:58 PM

May 28, 2025

CONFIDENTIAL: EXCLUSIVELY FOR PURPOSES HEREIN IN RELATION TO THE HRT0 PROCEEDING

VIA EMAIL

TO:

Ontario Court of Justice
7755 Hurontario Street
Brampton, Ontario L6W 4T1

("Brampton Courthouse")

(see: Brampton.OCJ.courts@ontario.ca)

TO BE FORWARDED TO OR DIRECTED TO OR TO THEIR LEGAL COUNSEL FOR MATTERS INVOLVING AND RELIEF SOUGHT IN THE **MOTION PACKAGE**:

Kind attention: Chief Justice of the ONCJ

The Honourable Sharon M. Nicklas
Chief Justice of the Ontario Court of Justice

Kind attention: Associate Chief Justice of the ONCJ and Coordinator Of Justices of the Peace of Ontario ("JOP Coordinator")

The Honourable Jeanine E. LeRoy
Associate Chief Justice — Coordinator of Justices of the Peace of the Ontario Court of Justice

Kind attention: Justice of the Peace Mr. George Jiri of the ONCJ (Brampton Courthouse) ("JP Jiri")

Tribunal file number: HRT0 2024-58615-I (the "**HRT0 Proceeding**")

Type of document: Email with attachment

Short title of proceeding: *McLean v. Goldview, Artopoulos, TPS et al*

Party: Applicant (Mr. Kevin A. McLean (B.A., J.D., CIM))

Re: My Section 16.1 of the SPPA and Rule 23 Motion: (i) Motion Form; (ii) Declaration #10 in support (reliance on all previous declarations filed and served); and (iii) Motion Submissions ("Motion Package")

Dear Sirs/Mesdames/Other Gender-Neutral Pronouns:

1. I am obliged to provide you with notice of my above Motion Package, including the formal service of the same, for service upon you so that you have notice and are entitled to provide whether you oppose and/or consent and/or provide a

position to the relief sought. This Motion Package exclusively relates to the HRTO Proceeding and the relief I am seeking therein.

2. I would be most grateful to know whether you have legal counsel to the ONCJ and said Brampton Courthouse along with that Justice Of Peace Jiri involving the same so I can communicate with said individuals on behalf of the above. It will also allow me to provide designed lawyer licensees with any other records involving the same.

3. I can confirm that the above documents have been filed with the HRTO and the Respondents have been served. I have also served, as there is a notice of constitutional question from November 2024, the AGO and AGC with the Motion Package.

4. I await to hear from you at your convenience and remain available to answer any questions or queries regarding the same. In brief, you will see that I have declared that I believe JP Jiri's good name and reputation has been impersonated by a purported forged 'digital signature' (although there is no signature in fact) (see: Declaration #10, Exhibit "A", page 3). As such, I will be delivering a copy of this Motion Package to the ONSC (Chief Justice, Regional Senior Justice of the ONSC et al) to determine who was the in the fact judge (ONSC) (if any at that level inclusive of Divisional Court) was that received the same and perhaps granted what was represented to me as an "arrest warrant" (Form 7). Obviously, it is not such an arrest warrant but stylized as an "Intake Court Endorsement" (absent endorsement). As the facts involved in the HRTO Proceeding involve a matter in Toronto, it seems rather odd to me that JP Jiri (assigned to Brampton) would have had any involvement in the same.

5. As such, it may be that Brampton Courthouse never had a justice receive any such documents but I would be most grateful to know and I will presume that any further communication will come through counsel to any of the above.

6. To confirm, I am not seeking any records that could be construed under 'adjudicative privilege' but rather merely whether records exist in relation to the alleged Form 2 declared by a court officer in Toronto in Ms. Frugoni-Rojas on September 23, 2024. I presume based on the distance from Toronto to Brampton that if any such records existed they would have been provided via email or fax to the Brampton Courthouse and then forwarded to any such justice or justice of the peace for his or her consideration.

7. As I am required by the HRTO Specific Rules to file a statement of delivery ("SOD"), I will do so. Should you wish to provide a formal response in accordance with the *HR Code*, which is obviously paramount to any other provincial statutes, the email for the HRTO Registrar is: hrtoregistrar@ontario.ca. If names of the counsel for Respondents are required, I can provide those as well.

8. As I believe that this is a matter that both the Chief Justice of the ONCJ and Associate Chief Justice and JOP Coordinator are required to investigate, I will presume that this email will be forwarded to them for their review and consideration involving this non-adjudicative but administrative matters.

9. If no records exist, I would be most grateful to know at the earliest knowledge of the same from whomever wishes to respond by way of counsel presumably. As such, I will respect the solemn and serious nature, along with its eccentricities albeit not created by myself, of the same and I await for a response or responses.

10. Thank you kindly.

Yours truly,

Mr. Kevin A. McLean (B.A. (MCL), J.D., CIM) (he/him)

(e): mcleansettlement@gmail.com

Disclaimer:

1. *The contents of this email are strictly confidential, unless otherwise noted, and are only intended for the recipients of said email.*

2. *If you receive this email in error, please reply to me by separate email and confirm the same by double deleting my errant email. I will do the same for you.*

3 attachments



Submissions - Interim Interlocutory Orders - Applicant - Moving Party - Mr McLean -28-May-2025.pdf
591K



Motion - Interlocutory Orders - TPS - Applicant - McLean - 27-May-2025.pdf
793K



Declaration #10 - Applicant - Mr. McLean - Declared - May-28-2025.pdf
1777K

Mr. Kevin McLean <mcleansettlement@gmail.com>
To: Brampton.OCJ.courts@ontario.ca, BramptonSCJCourt@ontario.ca

Wed, May 28, 2025 at 9:20 PM

Dear Sirs/Mesdames et al:

I have also included the above email in the event it involved a SCJ at the Brampton Courthouse and not JP Jiri of the ONCJ. I am solely directing this to that email from a courthouse standpoint as I am also serving the Offices of the Chief Justice, Associate Chief Justice and Regional Senior Justice (Toronto Region) of the Ontario Superior Court of Justice.

I trust it is not lost that I find it most regrettable and counter to the access of justice but this is the proverbial hand I was dealt.

I have done all of the above out of an abundance of caution. I will await to hear from the relevant persons. Thank you.

Yours truly,

Mr. Kevin A. McLean (B.A. (MCL), J.D., CIM) (he/him)

(e): mcleansettlement@gmail.com

Disclaimer:

1. *The contents of this email are strictly confidential, unless otherwise noted, and are only intended for the recipients of said email.*
2. *If you receive this email in error, please reply to me by separate email and confirm the same by double deleting my errant email. I will do the same for you.*

Meegwetch | Merci | Thank you |

[Quoted text hidden]