

Reply to: Mr. Kevin A. McLean (BA, JD, CIM)
Via email: mclean@searchandseizure.ca
Internal copy to: mcleansettlement@gmail.com
Via fax: 416.352.0055

Date: July 16, 2026

Classification: Private and Confidential

Time sensitive: URGENT (outstanding issues with respect to providing access to an accused/party of copies of Information/Indictment and endorsements upon request without fees)

Sending method: Via Email and Facsimile at first instance

To:

The Honourable Chief Justice Mr. Patrick Boucher, Superior Court of Justice (Ontario)
130 Queen Street West
Toronto, Ontario

**SUBJECT I: URGENT AND PEREMPTORY REQUISITION FOR CHIEF JUSTICE INTERVENTION
PURSUANT TO THE DOCTRINE OF PRIMUS INTER PARES CONCERNING THE SPOILIATION OF THE
COURT RECORD AND JURISDICTIONAL NULLITY**
**SUBJECT II: MANDATORY INVOCATION OF SECTIONS 72 AND 76 OF THE COURTS OF JUSTICE ACT
TO RECTIFY SYSTEMIC DOCUMENTARY WITHHOLDING AND ENSURE CONSTITUTIONAL
COMPLIANCE**

Table of Contents

Subject I: URGENT AND PEREMPTORY REQUISITION FOR CHIEF JUSTICE INTERVENTION PURSUANT TO THE DOCTRINE OF PRIMUS INTER PARES CONCERNING THE SPOLIATION OF THE COURT RECORD AND JURISDICTIONAL NULLITY1

Subject II: MANDATORY INVOCATION OF SECTIONS 72 AND 76 OF THE COURTS OF JUSTICE ACT TO RECTIFY SYSTEMIC DOCUMENTARY WITHHOLDING AND ENSURE CONSTITUTIONAL COMPLIANCE1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY3

Subject: URGENT — Final Requisition under s.76 Courts of Justice Act — Production and Preservation of Native Form 2/Form 4 and Endorsements (Police Case ID 457197).....3

Part I: Introduction, Congratulatory Remarks, and Primary Procedural Posture.....10

Part II: Jurisdictional Nullity, Core Jurisdiction, and the Rule of Law13

Part III: Technological Spoliation and the Fabrication of the Judicial Record14

Part IV: Strict Application of Canadian Judicial Council Frameworks17

Part V: Ethical Imperatives and the Disciplinary Mandate19

Part VI: The Thirteen Constitutional Duties of the Primus Inter Pares.....20

Part VII: Concluding Imperatives and Formal Requisition22

Dear Sirs/Mesdames/Other Gender-Neutral Pronouns:

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

SUBJECT: URGENT — FINAL REQUISITION UNDER S.76 COURTS OF JUSTICE ACT — PRODUCTION AND PRESERVATION OF NATIVE FORM 2/FORM 4 AND ENDORSEMENTS (POLICE CASE ID 457197)

Dear Honourable Chief Justice of the Superior Court of Justice of Ontario (“SCJ”), President of the “Court of Ontario” and President of the Divisional Court:

Please accept my sincerest congratulations on your recent elevation to Chief Justice. While I rigorously acknowledge that your time is **incredibly valuable** and the administrative demands upon your office are immense, I hereby requisition your immediate intervention as an absolute, imperative first of many steps to restore honour, trust, and dignity to the Superior Court of Justice and your venerated post.

I hereby requisition the immediate, unmitigated exercise of your supervisory powers under section 76 of the *Courts of Justice Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43, to direct registry staff at the SCJ 361 University Avenue Courthouse to produce, without charge and forthwith, the natively generated *Criminal Code* Form 2 (or Form 4) and any and all intake endorsements, warrants, and associated systemic audit logs for Police Case ID 457197.

The extant, non-delegable obligation to remit specific judicial records remains egregiously and systematically unfulfilled. The continuous, orchestrated sequestration of these foundational instruments constitutes a direct, actionable contravention of the mandatory strictures codified within the *Criminal Proceedings Rules for the Superior Court of Justice (Ontario)*, and fundamentally offends the constitutionally protected open court principle. It is rigorously submitted that such administrative withholding effectuates a localized suspension of the rule of law, operating to shield potentially ultra vires state action from mandatory appellate scrutiny.

Factual basis:

My lawful yet repeated, formalized requests executed since Summer 2025 have been met with profound administrative silence and deliberate obfuscation, thereby establishing a protracted and systemic breach of the duty of honest performance and the doctrine of legitimate expectations. Furthermore, the exhaustive forensic analysis appended hereto incontrovertibly indicates post-production algorithmic manipulation utilizing third-party software (GrapeCity Documents for PDF). This illicit technological intervention precipitated the catastrophic destruction of the Public Key Infrastructure cryptographic hashes and generated structural anomalies indicative of a synthesized, artificially stitched document. Appendices A–E are attached, intricately indexed, and incorporated by reference herein.

Directions requested (by 5:00 p.m. on Monday, July 20, 2026):

Direct the Manager of Court Operations at the Originating Court Office of the Originating Courthouse(s) to unconditionally extract and deliver the natively generated, unredacted, and unadulterated copies of the Form 2/Form 4 and all corresponding endorsements to the undersigned by the strict temporal deadline.

Direct SCJ IT/Records custodians to immediately preserve all server backups, relational database entries, systemic audit logs, relational metadata, and any prior iterative versions of the digital files; strictly and unconditionally prohibit any deletion, alteration, database-level excision, or further spoliation of the subject *acta*.

Direct immediate production of all systemic audit logs demonstrating the chronological creation, modification, export parameters, and user access histories for the relevant files, definitively verifying the chain of digital custody and exposing the locus of the technological manipulation.

Appoint an independent, court-approved IT custodian to verify the absolute preservation of the digital ecosystem and, if structurally necessitated by internal database corruption, to extract the native files for rigorous cryptographic verification against the purportedly valid artifacts presently relied upon by state actors.

While the False Information Package is one of, if not, the worst false documents and forgeries (on multiple levels) (along with OCJ Brampton Courthouse having no record of any such involvement of one JP Mr. Jiri or its courthouse at all), to the extent that you as the President of the “Court of Ontario” (see: Courts of Justice Act, s. 10) find that there were other Criminal Code Form 2 Informations being housed, controlled or custodied in the OCJ, whether at first instance or otherwise, kindly provide them to me forthwith as per my requests for the same:

Menu

Information Package 48_ x

+ Create

Add file to PDF Space

All tools

Edit

Convert

E-Sign

Find text, tools, or help

Share

Ask AI Assistant

☒ IPV (Intimate Partner Violence / Violence contre un partenaire intime)

☐ S (Impaired driving with substances / Conduite avec capacités affaiblies par des substances)

☐ V (Vessel / Bateau)

Arrest Date: 15 month Flag: 18 month Flag:

Date d'arrestation: Alerie à 15 mois (ddmmyy / jmmaa) Alerie à 18 mois (ddmmyy / jmmaa)

Sworn Date: 230924 15 month Flag: 241225 18 month Flag: 250326

Date d'assementation: Alerie à 15 mois (ddmmyy / jmmaa) Alerie à 18 mois (ddmmyy / jmmaa)

4810 998 24 48129169

Information Number / N° de la dénonciation

NOTICE: Orders concerning this court Information relating to publication bans, non-disclosure/communication and French-language rights, are available on a separate page and must be followed.

AVIS: Les ordonnances liées à la présente dénonciation en ce qui a trait aux interdictions de publication, à la non-divulgateion ou à la non-communication et aux droits linguistiques des francophones figurent sur une page distincte. Ces ordonnances doivent être respectées.

Form 2 Information / Formule 2 Dénonciation

Sections 506, 508.1 and 788 of the Criminal Code / Articles 506, 508.1 et 788 du Code criminel

CANADA

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

PROVINCE DE L'ONTARIO

TORONTO

(Region / Région)

Information of: Christyn Frugoni-Rojas

Dénonciation de :

of THE CITY OF TORONTO

de

Court Officer

(occupation / profession)

hereinafter called the informant / ci-après appelé(e) le dénonciateur

The informant says that he/she believes on reasonable grounds that

Le dénonciateur déclare qu'il a des motifs raisonnables de croire que

(1) MCLEAN, Kevin DOB: 25 Mar. 1983

NFA, , ON

COUNT 1

Kevin MCLEAN

on or about the 22nd day of September in the year 2024 at the City of Toronto in the

Toronto Region did, without lawful authority and knowing that another person, namely

Nicole ARTOPOULOS, was harassed or recklessly as to whether that person was harassed,

engage in repeatedly communicating with, either directly or indirectly, that person,

and cause the said Nicole ARTOPOULOS to reasonably fear for personal safety, contrary

to Section 264, subsection (2), clause (b) of the Criminal Code of Canada.

concrete timeline so we are respectful of the public purse.

Page 3 of 16

6562 words

English (Canada)

Text Predictions: On

Accessibility: Good to go

Focus

132%

Menu Information Package 48... x + Create

Add file to PDF Space | All tools Edit Convert E-Sign

Find text, tools, or help Q 60 | Save Print Share Ask AI Assistant

Declaration of Informant / Déclaration du dénonciateur

I declare that all matters contained in the Information are true to my knowledge and belief, pursuant to s. 508.1(2) of the *Criminal Code*.
Je soussigné(e) déclare tous les renseignements contenus dans la présente dénonciation sont, à ma connaissance, véridiques, en vertu de
par. 508.1(2) du Code criminel.

Dated at CITY of TORONTO in the Province of Ontario, this 23rd day of SEPTEMBER, 20 24
Fait à (au) dans la province d'Ontario, ce jour de

Declared / Déclaré
Christyn Frugoni-Rojas CL (M)
Digitally signed by
Christyn Frugoni-Rojas CL (M)
Date: 2024.09.23
11:48:25 -04'00'

Digital Signature of Informant / Signature numérique du dénonciateur

CCO-2-020-1-C-e (rev.10/23) This document has been digitally signed / Ce document a été signé numériquement.

Toronto Police Service Police Case ID: 457197
Occ#: 24-2082035
Intake Court Endorsement

This Information is Accepted on its face

I can answer them.

Page 4 of 16 6562 words English (Canada) Text Predictions: On Accessibility: Investigate Focus

Page 6 of 24: July 17, 2026

Menu

Information Package 48_

Create

Add file to PDF Space

All tools

Edit

Convert

E-Sign

Find text, tools, or help

60

Save

Share

Ask AI Assistant

Information No. / N° de la dénonciation Return Date / Date à laquelle le document est rapporté 20 INFORMATION Against / DÉNONCIATION visant MCLEAN, Kevin Address / Adresse NFA ON CHARGE / ACCUSATION HARASSMENT BY REPEATED COMMUNICATION WITH PERSON Refer to front page for further courts / Reportez-vous à la première page pour plus de détails FOR ADMINISTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY À DES FINS ADMINISTRATIVES SEULEMENT ☐ Summons ☐ Show Cause ☒ Warrant 1st Audience de justification Mandat en 1^{re} instance ☐ Replacement Information / Dénonciation de remplacement ☐ Reportable M.V. ☐ C.V.O.R. No (Commercial Vehicles Only)

Infraction V.M. à déclarer (Code de la route 199)

Numéro C.I.U.V.U. (véhicules utilitaires seulement)

Sex

Birth Date / Date de naissance

Day / Jour

Month / Mois

Year / Année

Was defendant owner? / La partie défenderesse était-elle propriétaire?

Yes / Oui

No / Non

Driver's Licence Number / Numéro du permis de conduire

M16514331830325

Plate No. / Numéro de plaque

☐ Involves a Collision / Infraction reliée à un accident

Informant

Dénonciateur

Christyn Frugoni-Rojas

Deemed Sworn / Affirmed Date

SEP 23rd, 24

Date of Arrest / Date de l'arrestation

Officer / Agent de police

No. / N°

82239

Police Agency / Service de police

Div. / Dist.

TORONTO POLICE SERVICE 14 DIVISION

Occurrence Number / N° d'incident

24-2082035

Courtroom / Salle d'audience

 Information No. / N° de la dénonciation Return Date / Date à laquelle le document est rapporté 20 INFORMATION Against / DÉNONCIATION visant Address / Adresse CHARGE / ACCUSATION Refer to front page for further courts / Reportez-vous à la première page pour plus de détails FOR ADMINISTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY À DES FINS ADMINISTRATIVES SEULEMENT ☐ Summons ☐ Show Cause ☐ Warrant 1st Audience de justification Mandat en 1^{re} instance ☐ Replacement Information / Dénonciation de remplacement ☐ Reportable M.V. ☐ C.V.O.R. No (Commercial Vehicles Only) |

Infraction V.M. à déclarer (Code de la route 199)

Numéro C.I.U.V.U. (véhicules utilitaires seulement)

Sex

Birth Date / Date de naissance

Day / Jour

Month / Mois

Year / Année

Was defendant owner? / La partie défenderesse était-elle propriétaire?

Yes / Oui

No / Non

Driver's Licence Number / Numéro du permis de conduire

Plate No. / Numéro de plaque

☐ Involves a Collision / Infraction reliée à un accident

Informant

Dénonciateur

Deemed Sworn / Affirmed Date

Date of Arrest / Date de l'arrestation

Officer / Agent de police

No. / N°

Police Agency / Service de police

Div. / Dist.

Occurrence Number / N° d'incident

Courtroom / Salle d'audience

 Information No. / N° de la dénonciation Return Date / Date à laquelle le document est rapporté 20 INFORMATION Against / DÉNONCIATION visant Address / Adresse CHARGE / ACCUSATION Refer to front page for further courts / Reportez-vous à la première page pour plus de détails FOR ADMINISTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY À DES FINS ADMINISTRATIVES SEULEMENT ☐ Summons ☐ Show Cause ☐ Warrant 1st Audience de justification Mandat en 1^{re} instance ☐ Replacement Information / Dénonciation de remplacement ☐ Reportable M.V. ☐ C.V.O.R. No (Commercial Vehicles Only) |

Infraction V.M. à déclarer (Code de la route 199)

Numéro C.I.U.V.U. (véhicules utilitaires seulement)

Sex

Birth Date / Date de naissance

Day / Jour

Month / Mois

Year / Année

Was defendant owner? / La partie défenderesse était-elle propriétaire?

Yes / Oui

No / Non

Driver's Licence Number / Numéro du permis de conduire

Plate No. / Numéro de plaque

☐ Involves a Collision / Infraction reliée à un accident

Informant

Dénonciateur

Deemed Sworn / Affirmed Date

Date of Arrest / Date de l'arrestation

Officer / Agent de police

No. / N°

Police Agency / Service de police

Div. / Dist.

Occurrence Number / N° d'incident

Courtroom / Salle d'audience

Page 6 of 18

6572 words

English (Canada)

Text Predictions: On

Accessibility: Investigate

Focus

132%

The pages that were and are missing are:

(page 4 of 6 which is at Appendix B)

[illegible]

(page 5 of 6 which is at Appendix B)

Menu
ADULT-COMMON-INFO_ x
+ Create

Find text, tools, or help
Share
Ask AI Assistant

Count / Chef

☐ Pre-sentence custody ☐ days/months ☐ Time credited: ☐ days/months ☐ Concurrent with ☐ ☐ Term that would have been imposed before credit granted: ☐ days/months/years ☐ ☐ Period of imprisonment imposed avant l'octroi de tout crédit: ☐ jours/mois/ans

☐ Absolute discharge ☐ Conditional discharge ☐ Suspended sentence ☐ ☐ Absolution inconditionnelle ☐ Absolution conditionnelle ☐ Condamnation avec sursis

☐ Imprisoned for ☐ days/months/years ☐ concurrent with ☐ consecutive to ☐ ☐ Emprisonnement pour ☐ jours/mois/ans ☐ concurrent avec ☐ consécutif à ☐ ☐ Intermittent sentence for ☐ days ☐ concurrent with ☐ consecutive to ☐ ☐ Pénitence discontinue ☐ jours ☐ concurrente avec ☐ consécutif à ☐ ☐ Conditional sentence for ☐ days/months/years ☐ concurrent with ☐ consecutive to ☐ ☐ Ordonnance de sursis ☐ jours/mois/ans ☐ concurrente avec ☐ consécutif à ☐ ☐ Probation ☐ months/years ☐ concurrent with ☐ consecutive to ☐ ☐ Période de probation ☐ mois/ans ☐ concurrente avec ☐ consécutif à ☐ ☐ Community service s.732.1(3)(f) / Service communautaire, par.732.1(3)(f) ☐ hours / heures ☐ Days in default ☐ ☐ Fine of \$ ☐ sur. comp. ☐ \$ Délai de paiement ☐ Jours à défaut ☐ ☐ Amende de ☐ s. 738 / s. 739 ☐ Amount: \$ ☐ Time to pay ☐ \$ Délai de paiement ☐ ☐ Restitution ☐ s. 738 / art. 739 ☐ Victim surcharge: \$ ☐ Time to pay: ☐ Days in default ☐ ☐ Suramende compensatoire ☐ \$ Délai de paiement ☐ Jours à défaut ☐ ☐ Ordered to stand trial: / Renvoyé pour subir son procès

☐ Dismissed ☐ Driving prohibition: ☐ HTA cautioned ☐ Months / Years ☐ s.743.2(1) / par. 743.2(1) ☐ ☐ Releasé ☐ Interdiction de conduite ☐ Avertissement (Code de la route) ☐ mois/années ☐ ☐ Acquitted ☐ Weapons prohibition: ☐ s. 109(2) ☐ years ☐ s. 109(3) (Life) ☐ art. 110 ☐ years ☐ s. 110 (life) ☐ ☐ Acquitte ☐ Interdiction d'armes ☐ par. 109(2) ☐ ans ☐ s. 109(3) (vie) ☐ art. 110 ☐ ans ☐ art. 110 (éternité) ☐ ☐ Stayed ☐ DNA: ☐ 5.03 (Primary) ☐ 5.04 (Secondary) ☐ Denied (DND) ☐ ☐ Surst ☐ ADN ☐ 5.03 (primaire) ☐ 5.04 (secondaire) ☐ Rejetée ☐ ☐ In Absentia ☐ S.O.I.R.A. order: ☐ 10 years ☐ 20 years ☐ Life ☐ ☐ Other ☐ Ordonnance LERD ☐ 10 ans ☐ 20 ans ☐ Perpétuité ☐ ☐ Autre ☐ s. 161 prohibition: ☐ months/years ☐ s. 490 forfeiture order: ☐ Granted ☐ Denied ☐ ☐ Interdiction, art. 161 ☐ mois/ans ☐ Ordonnance de confiscation, art. 490 ☐ Accordée ☐ Rejetée

Count / Chef

☐ Pre-sentence custody ☐ days/months ☐ Time credited: ☐ days/months ☐ Concurrent with ☐ ☐ Term that would have been imposed before credit granted: ☐ days/months/years ☐ ☐ Period of imprisonment imposed avant l'octroi de tout crédit: ☐ jours/mois/ans

☐ Absolute discharge ☐ Conditional discharge ☐ Suspended sentence ☐ ☐ Absolution inconditionnelle ☐ Absolution conditionnelle ☐ Condamnation avec sursis

☐ Imprisoned for ☐ days/months/years ☐ concurrent with ☐ consecutive to ☐ ☐ Emprisonnement pour ☐ jours/mois/ans ☐ concurrent avec ☐ consécutif à ☐ ☐ Intermittent sentence for ☐ days ☐ concurrent with ☐ consecutive to ☐ ☐ Pénitence discontinue ☐ jours ☐ concurrente avec ☐ consécutif à ☐ ☐ Conditional sentence for ☐ days/months/years ☐ concurrent with ☐ consecutive to ☐ ☐ Ordonnance de sursis ☐ jours/mois/ans ☐ concurrente avec ☐ consécutif à ☐ ☐ Probation ☐ months/years ☐ concurrent with ☐ consecutive to ☐ ☐ Période de probation ☐ mois/ans ☐ concurrente avec ☐ consécutif à ☐ ☐ Community service s.732.1(3)(f) / Service communautaire, par.732.1(3)(f) ☐ hours / heures ☐ Days in default ☐ ☐ Fine of \$ ☐ sur. comp. ☐ \$ Délai de paiement ☐ Jours à défaut ☐ ☐ Amende de ☐ s. 738 / s. 739 ☐ Amount: \$ ☐ Time to pay ☐ \$ Délai de paiement ☐ ☐ Restitution ☐ s. 738 / art. 739 ☐ Victim surcharge: \$ ☐ Time to pay: ☐ Days in default ☐ ☐ Suramende compensatoire ☐ \$ Délai de paiement ☐ Jours à défaut ☐ ☐ Ordered to stand trial: / Renvoyé pour subir son procès

☐ Dismissed ☐ Driving prohibition: ☐ HTA cautioned ☐ Months / Years ☐ s.743.2(1) / par. 743.2(1) ☐ ☐ Releasé ☐ Interdiction de conduite ☐ Avertissement (Code de la route) ☐ mois/années ☐ ☐ Acquitted ☐ Weapons prohibition: ☐ s. 109(2) ☐ years ☐ s. 109(3) (Life) ☐ art. 110 ☐ years ☐ s. 110 (life) ☐ ☐ Acquitte ☐ Interdiction d'armes ☐ par. 109(2) ☐ ans ☐ s. 109(3) (vie) ☐ art. 110 ☐ ans ☐ art. 110 (éternité) ☐ ☐ Stayed ☐ DNA: ☐ 5.03 (Primary) ☐ 5.04 (Secondary) ☐ Denied (DND) ☐ ☐ Surst ☐ ADN ☐ 5.03 (primaire) ☐ 5.04 (secondaire) ☐ Rejetée ☐ ☐ In Absentia ☐ S.O.I.R.A. order: ☐ 10 years ☐ 20 years ☐ Life ☐ ☐ Other ☐ Ordonnance LERD ☐ 10 ans ☐ 20 ans ☐ Perpétuité ☐ ☐ Autre ☐ s. 161 prohibition: ☐ months/years ☐ s. 490 forfeiture order: ☐ Granted ☐ Denied ☐ ☐ Interdiction, art. 161 ☐ mois/ans ☐ Ordonnance de confiscation, art. 490 ☐ Accordée ☐ Rejetée

Page 8 of 20
6598 words
English (Canada)
Text Predictions: On
Accessibility: Investigate

Focus
132%

TIMELINE

If you anticipate any issues in meeting the respectful deadline of **July 20, 2026**, please inform me forthwith so I can adjust my expectations accordingly. If there are any potential or expected delays in meeting the same, please provide me with a concrete timeline so we are respectful of the public purse.

Should you have any questions or require clarification, please contact me at your earliest convenience via email or fax so I can answer them.

Upon receipt of the requested court documents of which I am entitled, I will confirm safe receipt of the same and consider the matter closed.

The remainder of this letter is, in my humble view, a high level analysis and application of the law to the facts herein.

With gratitude,



Mr. Kevin A. McLean (BA, JD, CIM)

PART I: INTRODUCTION, CONGRATULATORY REMARKS, AND PRIMARY PROCEDURAL POSTURE

1. It is with profound respect, unwavering deference to the institution of the independent judiciary, and a resolute, uncompromising commitment to the unwritten constitutional principle of the rule of law that formal congratulations are hereby extended to the Honourable Chief Justice Boucher upon the occasion of your recent elevation and the assumption of the mantle of the highest judicial office within the Superior Court of Justice. The historical weight, the institutional gravity, and the profound constitutional significance of this appointment are rigorously acknowledged. It is deeply appreciated that the administrative, supervisory, and adjudicative demands inherently placed upon your valuable time are immense, particularly during this transitional epoch where the institutional direction, ethical tone, and public transparency of the tribunal are being firmly established under your leadership. As the ultimate steward of the constitutional trust, the obligations resting upon your office are of unparalleled magnitude. Nevertheless, this immediate, exigent intervention is necessitated as an imperative, unavoidable first step to definitively restore the honour, public trust, and unassailable dignity to the Superior Court of Justice and your venerated post following the departure of your predecessor. The preservation of the institutional integrity of the judicature demands unwavering, perpetual vigilance, particularly when confronted with incontrovertibly documented instances of administrative recalcitrance that threaten to systemically subvert the constitutional order, erode public confidence in the administration of justice, and fracture the foundational social contract betwixt the citizenry and the courts. It is respectfully posited that addressing localized administrative capture, dismantling extra-legal judicial silos, and curing profound documentary spoliation represents the absolute paramount duty of the incoming Chief Justice, serving to immediately signal an uncompromising return to absolute judicial transparency and strict adherence to statutory mandates. The judiciary cannot function as an impenetrable monolith shielded by bureaucratic stasis; it must operate in the piercing light of public accountability.
2. At the absolute vanguard of this correspondence is an uncompromising, peremptory demand representing the paramount, superseding objective of this entire requisition: the immediate, unredacted, and natively generated production of the withheld foundational adjudicative documents (the “**Court Documents**”) to the applicant (the

“Applicant”) by no later than 5:00 p.m., July 20, 2026. This temporal mandate is strict, unyielding, and absolutely non-negotiable. It is fundamentally necessitated to arrest the continuing, irremediable prejudice inflicted upon the liberty and security interests of the subject of the proceedings—interests fiercely and perpetually protected by section 7 and section 11(d) of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, Part I of the *Constitution Act, 1982*, being Schedule B to the *Canada Act 1982* (U.K.), 1982, c. 11 (the **“Charter”**). The sustained, seemingly orchestrated deprivation of these foundational *acta* systematically eviscerates the capacity of the Accused to make full answer and defence, effectively weaponizing bureaucratic silence against enshrined constitutional guarantees. The imposition of silence by the administrative state in the face of a formalized demand for the originating process constitutes an actionable abrogation of the duty of honest performance owed by public servants, a doctrine robustly affirmed by the Supreme Court of Canada in *Bhasin v. Hrynew*, 2014 SCC 71 and *C.M. Callow Inc. v. Zollinger*, 2020 SCC 45. It is with a resolute commitment to unyielding procedural rectitude, the principles of fundamental justice, and the absolute preservation of the constitutional trust that this comprehensive correspondence is formally advanced. This requisition is buttressed in its entirety by the meticulously compiled evidentiary record (the **“Evidentiary Record”**, specifically the document entitled “Appendices A to E_pagenumber - Evidence - Request CJ SCJ Boucher.pdf”). The immediate, affirmative, and directive intervention of the Chief Justice of the Superior Court of Justice is hereby strictly requisitioned regarding the protracted, systemic, and unlawful sequestration of these Court Documents at the SCJ 361 University Avenue Courthouse (the **“Originating Courthouse”**), specifically within the obscured recesses of the first-floor registry (the **“Originating Court Office”**).

3. The fundamental crux of this necessary administrative and judicial escalation is predicated upon the absolute, sustained failure of the administrative apparatus to produce the mandatory *Criminal Code*, R.S.C., 1985, c. C-46 (the **“Criminal Code”**) form 2 information (the **“Form 2 Information”**) or, in the alternative, the *Criminal Code* form 4 indictment (the **“Form 4 Indictment”**), alongside any and all corresponding judicial authorizations, bench warrants, or intake court endorsements (the **“Endorsements”**). It is an incontrovertible, indefeasible statutory entitlement that such *acta* must be provided free of charge and immediately upon request pursuant to the strictures of the *Administration of Justice Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. A.6, and explicitly governed by the *Superior Court of Justice*

and Court of Appeal - Fees, O. Reg. 293/92. This specific regulatory framework definitively establishes the absolute legal right of an accused individual to receive unadulterated, unredacted copies of informations, indictments, and endorsements without the exaction of any prescribed administrative tariffs, bureaucratic preconditions, or procedural impediments. The statutory architecture was purposefully and meticulously designed to ensure that the coercive power of the state is perpetually matched by absolute documentary transparency, explicitly prohibiting the administrative state from imposing financial barriers or leveraging bureaucratic stasis to restrict access to foundational jurisdictional records. The withholding of such records functionally deprives the subject of the capacity to assess the lawful foundation of their apprehension, effectuating a profound denial of natural justice.

4. The legislative intent underpinning the *Administration of Justice Act* and the strict fee exemptions codified within *O. Reg. 293/92* is unequivocally clear: the state is strictly prohibited from erecting financial, procedural, or bureaucratic barriers that would function to deny an accused individual access to the very instruments ostensibly authorizing their deprivation of liberty. The legislation emphatically does not afford the registry staff, court management, or their statutory delegates the discretion to delay, obfuscate, or deny access to these foundational instruments of penal authority based upon localized preferences, internal administrative inefficiencies, or the clandestine directives of extra-jurisdictional actors. The imposition of administrative silence functionally constructs an opaque bureaucratic tollbooth that is fundamentally incompatible with the prompt administration of justice, systematically depriving the reviewing appellate tribunal of the essential evidentiary substrate required for meaningful judicial review. Such administrative inertia transcends mere clerical delay; it transforms the registry from a neutral facilitator of justice into an active impediment to the realization of constitutional rights, effectuating a localized suspension of the rule of law. When a public authority makes representations regarding the provision of access—as evidenced within the appended correspondence—and subsequently fails to fulfill those representations, it precipitates a catastrophic breach of the doctrine of legitimate expectations, a standard rigorously defined by the Supreme Court of Canada in *Baker v. Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration)*, [1999] 2 S.C.R. 817.

PART II: JURISDICTIONAL NULLITY, CORE JURISDICTION, AND THE RULE OF LAW

5. The systemic, seemingly orchestrated refusal by the Originating Court Office to fulfill its non-delegable ministerial duties effectively paralyzes the adjudicative process, preventing the subject of the proceedings from accessing the very instruments upon which the coercive power of the state is ostensibly justified. This sustained documentary deprivation fundamentally subverts the essential procedural safeguards meticulously designed by Parliament to protect the liberty of the subject and directly offends the unwritten constitutional principle of the rule of law. As definitively reaffirmed in *Toronto (City) v. Ontario (Attorney General)*, 2021 SCC 34, such unwritten constitutional principles possess full legal force and strictly govern the interpretation of state action. Furthermore, as forcefully articulated by the Supreme Court of Canada in *Trial Lawyers Association of British Columbia v. British Columbia (Attorney General)*, 2014 SCC 59 (the “TLABC 2014”), the core jurisdiction of the superior courts—rigidly protected by section 96 of the *Constitution Act, 1867*, 30 & 31 Vict., c. 3—is inextricably linked to the maintenance of the rule of law and the absolute, non-derogable necessity of unfettered public access to the courts. Measures, whether enacted via prohibitive legislative tariffs or effectuated through opaque administrative withholding, that functionally prevent individuals from holding the state to account strike at the very core of this constitutionally protected jurisdiction. A court that cannot, or will not, produce its own originating process ceases to function as a court of record, functionally abandoning its adjudicative mandate and devolving into an apparatus of arbitrary state power shielded by bureaucratic opacity. The administrative stasis exhibited herein is functionally equivalent to, and arguably more insidious than, the prohibitive hearing fees struck down in *TLABC 2014*. Both mechanisms operate to unconstitutionally deny the subject access to the adjudicative forum, rendering the state’s actions entirely immune from the very judicial scrutiny mandated by the Constitution. A repository that obfuscates its own foundational mandates eviscerates the public’s confidence in the impartiality and independence of the judicature.
6. Furthermore, it is rigorously submitted that such systemic documentary deprivation, coupled with the profound structural manipulation detailed herein, cannot be categorized as a mere, curable procedural irregularity under the remedial provisions of section 601 or section 485 of the *Criminal Code*. As affirmed by the Ontario Court of Appeal

in *König v. Hobza*, 2015 ONCA 885, a step taken in direct contravention of mandatory rules enters the realm of absolute nullity. In the absolute, sustained absence of the unadulterated originating instrument, the tribunal is fundamentally deprived of subject-matter jurisdiction (*ratione materiae*) *ab initio*. Actions undertaken absent the foundational jurisdictional prerequisites are incurably defective, intrinsically void, and cannot be retrospectively salvaged through judicial fiat, post-facto administrative rectification, or the invocation of the *de facto* doctrine. As definitively established in *MacMillan Bloedel Ltd. v. Simpson*, [1995] 4 S.C.R. 725, the inherent jurisdiction of a superior court is traditionally invoked as an adjunct to an existing right to protect the administration of justice; it is emphatically not a sword to be weaponized by the Crown to cure fatal procedural defects or to breathe legal life into an absolute epistemological void. The resultant phantom proceedings function entirely *coram non iudice* (before one who is not a judge of competent jurisdiction) and are utterly devoid of legal force, necessitating the immediate quashing of the resultant process via prerogative writ to definitively restore the *status quo ante*. The continued reliance upon an unproduced, unverified, and ostensibly manipulated *acta* by state law enforcement actors represents a continuous, compounding jurisdictional usurpation that must be immediately arrested by the supervisory authority of the Chief Justice. A statutory delegate or registry clerk possesses no inherent or equitable jurisdiction to arbitrarily withhold that which the law demands must be produced forthwith. The law does not recognize a jurisdiction predicated upon an invisible, sequestered, and cryptographically shattered foundation.

PART III: TECHNOLOGICAL SPOILIATION AND THE FABRICATION OF THE JUDICIAL RECORD
--

7. Exhaustive forensic analysis of the available digital artifacts demonstrates a catastrophic structural collision betwixt modern civil drafting architectures and rigid penal processing requirements, elevating this matter from an administrative delay to an active, algorithmic fabrication of the judicial record. It is incontrovertibly posited that the instruments relied upon by state law enforcement actors to authorize deprivations of liberty were technologically manipulated utilizing GrapeCity Documents for PDF software. This unauthorized, third-party algorithmic interference precipitated the irrevocable destruction of the Public Key Infrastructure cryptographic hashes (the “**PKI Hashes**”). A true, judicially valid cryptographic digital signature mathematically hashes the precise byte-

structure of a document at the exact moment of signing, irrevocably sealing its contents against subsequent modification. The destruction of these PKI Hashes obliterated the digital chain of custody, permanently fractured the cryptographic seal of the document, and systematically stripped the *acta* of its presumed authenticity. This mathematical obliteration conclusively confirms that the document was illicitly exported from the secure judicial repository and mathematically manipulated post-facto to obscure the identities of the true authors and the timeline of its genesis. Such actions effectively dismantle the zero-trust architecture mandated for secure judicial environments.

8. The precise mechanics of this algorithmic forgery are incontrovertibly established within the comprehensive forensic disquisition (see: Appendix E, GrapeCity Chart Analysis, pp. 107-111). This exhaustive analysis meticulously catalogues 29 specific internal and external errors, delineating the profound structural inadequacies of the resultant artifact. These catastrophic deviations include the deliberate deployment of family law terminology (“Intake Court Endorsement”) specifically engineered to bypass the rigorously audited criminal registry oversight of the Integrated Court Operation Network (the “**ICON**”). It further includes the application of a false six-digit Case Identification Number “457197” indicative of the civil FRANK architecture rather than the mandatory seven-digit criminal infrastructure required for all legitimate penal *acta*. Most egregiously, it features the erroneous, bad-faith substitution of the applicant’s residential address with “NFA” (No Fixed Address) to artificially and unlawfully compel a warrant *in the first instance*, actively misleading the reviewing tribunal as to the necessity of immediate, coercive state action by falsely portraying the Applicant as a transient flight risk. The totality of these specific, localized anomalies incontrovertibly points to the clandestine synthesis of this document within a specialized civil/family registry, thoroughly evading the structural procedural firewalls meticulously designed by Parliament to protect the liberty of the subject and functioning as a textbook instance of jurisdictional forum shopping.
9. Furthermore, the deep-level forensic analysis reveals profound typographic phenomena such as “stem shearing” and “rounded vector collapse.” In these instances, the algorithmic attempt by the GrapeCity software to programmatically erase existing digital signatures mathematically fractured the bounding boxes of the underlying

typography, creating visual aberrations that cannot occur organically through human input. Such DOC-6507 whitespace vulnerabilities and the triggering of internal “Item already has an owner” object exceptions within the PDF dictionary conclusively prove that the document was not organically authored by a judicial officer in a singular, linear fashion. Rather, it was created via an automated, back-end software process attempting to unlawfully amalgamate disparate, structurally incompatible PDF layers. The algorithmic collision between the embedded civil metadata and the artificially imposed criminal framework conclusively substantiates the deliberate spoliation, algorithmic stitching, and post-production synthesis of the *acta* by entities extraneous to the lawful adjudicative process, effectively reverse-engineering a judicial authorization to validate a prior, unlawful executive action. This algorithmic synthesis is a direct affront to the integrity of the court record.

10. Maintaining a deliberate silence in the face of a formal requisition constitutes a falsity by omission. As established in *Alevizos v. Nirula, 2003 MBCA 148*, silence and half-truths can amount to fraudulent misrepresentation, effectively functioning as active concealment. Such deliberate technological spoliation irrevocably vitiates the statutory presumption of systemic integrity afforded to electronic documents under section 31.2(1) of the *Canada Evidence Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-5, and fundamentally offends the strictures of the *Electronic Commerce Act*. The clandestine synthesis and post-production manipulation of a penal instrument within an obscured familial registry unequivocally engages the ancient, unyielding equitable doctrine of *fraus omnia corrumpit* (fraud vitiates everything). This venerable doctrine systematically unravels the resultant *acta*, dissolving any purported jurisdictional shield, permanently tainting the adjudicative stream, and necessitating the immediate, corrective intervention of the highest supervisory authority to strike the forged materials from the record to prevent the institutionalization of a fraud upon the court. The Supreme Court of Canada has consistently held that judicial process obtained via material non-disclosure or active deceit is voidable; process synthesized outside the lawful architecture entirely is an irremediable nullity. A statutory limitation clock cannot commence ticking upon an order that never lawfully existed; the fraud perpetrated upon the registry demands absolute administrative nullification and the restoration of the *status quo ante*. The judicature cannot passively countenance the technological fabrication of its own mandates.

PART IV: STRICT APPLICATION OF CANADIAN JUDICIAL COUNCIL FRAMEWORKS

11. The systemic withholding of the foundational *acta* by the Originating Court Office stands in direct, flagrant, and contumacious violation of the explicit, codified policies promulgated by the Canadian Judicial Council (the “CJC”). These comprehensive frameworks meticulously govern the security, retention, classification, and accessibility of court records, unequivocally establishing that the deliberate obfuscation of the Form 2 Information constitutes a gross abdication of both administrative duty and non-delegable judicial oversight. The judiciary is legally, ethically, and constitutionally bound to insulate its independence by ensuring that all adjudicative records remain strictly free from executive suppression, unrecorded algorithmic manipulation, or localized bureaucratic sequestration. The failure to adhere to these foundational frameworks signals a catastrophic breakdown in administrative governance.
12. *The Blueprint for the Security of Court Information (Seventh edition, April 2024)* (the “CJC Blueprint”) categorically establishes that the judiciary must maintain absolute, uncompromising ownership and control over Judicial Information, irrespective of which administrative body manages the physical servers or digital repositories. Policy 1b mandates that judicial users must operate within a distinct, isolated security domain, strictly insulated from executive interference or law enforcement data-mining. Policy 8 rigorously requires supply chain security to prevent unauthorized access, export, or manipulation by commercial or state law enforcement actors. The aforementioned technological spoliation, evidenced by the shattered PKI Hashes and the GrapeCity Software manipulation, profoundly offends the Zero Trust Architectures mandated by Policy 13d of the CJC Blueprint. This definitively proves an impermissible, unconstitutional infiltration of the judicial repository by external executive apparatuses, fundamentally destroying the separation of powers and rendering the underlying judicial processes subject to unauthorized executive manipulation and algorithmic synthesis. A repository that permits external entities to erase judicial signatures and stitch together disparate PDF objects ceases to function as a secure court of record and devolves into an apparatus of state coercion.

13. Pursuant to the *Model Definition of Judicial Information (September 2020)* (the “**CJC Model Definition**”), the

Form 2 Information incontrovertibly constitutes a primary, foundational component of the official Court Record (Adjudicative Information). It is emphatically not transient administrative data or a mere draft to be discarded at the whim of registry clerks; it is the fundamental *acta* demanding absolute transparency and mandatory production to the Accused *ex debito justitiae* (as a matter of right). This is rigorously reinforced by the *Model Policy for the Classification of Court Information (First edition, September 2022)* (the “**CJC Classification Policy**”). Utilizing this rigid taxonomy, an Information or Indictment is fundamentally classified as “Public” information, or at the absolute highest, “Restricted” information only if explicitly subject to a lawful, procedurally valid sealing order pronounced in open court. As no such sealing order exists on the formal record, the arbitrary administrative elevation of these documents to a *de facto* “Secret” classification constitutes an *ultra vires* usurpation of judicial authority by registry staff, completely subverting the open court principle as staunchly defended in *Sherman Estate v. Donovan*, 2021 SCC 25, and substituting opaque administrative prerogative for lawful judicial decree.

14. Furthermore, the *Model Policy for the Retention of Court Information (First edition, September 2022)* (the “**CJC Retention Policy**”) establishes the absolute, non-derogable necessity of preserving the court’s legacy and its master records for the entirety of their mandated lifecycles. Policy 1 mandates that a systematic approach must be utilized to preserve the court’s reputation for integrity, accuracy, and reliability, while Policy 12 explicitly requires the long-term preservation of the unadulterated master files to facilitate subsequent appellate or collateral review. The apparent destruction, database deletion, or physical excision of the uncorrupted Form 2 Information—resulting in the clandestine substitution of a structurally mutated digital artifact—violates these core tenets, constitutes an actionable spoliation of evidence, and fundamentally frustrates the appellate review mechanism, intentionally denying the Applicant the constitutionally enshrined capacity to make full answer and defence. A tribunal of inherent jurisdiction cannot lawfully operate upon documents that mysteriously vanish from the repository yet are subsequently utilized by state actors to justify an apprehension.

15. Furthermore, it is a matter of incontrovertible record that explicit confirmation has been procured from the Deputy Attorney General of Ontario affirming that no lawful directives for the destruction of any court documents or

materials were issued or executed within the relevant temporal parameter. Consequent to this executive admission, it is a deductive, unassailable certainty that the foundational *acta* remain in active existence within the digital or physical repository of the Originating Court Office. The continued administrative stasis cannot, therefore, be shielded under the guise of authorized records disposition; rather, it incontrovertibly constitutes an active, deliberate sequestration of extant judicial records, further exacerbating the documented breach of the duty of honest performance and cementing the inference of state-sponsored obfuscation. The judiciary must demand the production of that which the executive concedes has not been destroyed.

16. The profound absurdity of this administrative recalcitrance is cast into stark, undeniable relief when juxtaposed against the *Guidelines for Canadian Courts: Management of Requests for Bulk Access to Court Information by Commercial Entities* (April 2021). If the CJC has meticulously formulated structured guidelines to seamlessly facilitate the aggregation, automated extraction, analysis, and commercialization of vast swathes of court data for third-party corporate entities, credit reference agencies, and algorithmic data brokers, it is an insurmountable jurisprudential paradox to postulate that an accused individual—whose liberty, reputation, and security of the person are in active, immediate jeopardy—is unilaterally precluded from accessing their own localized, specific, and foundational charging instruments. The prioritization of commercial data mining over fundamental constitutional liberties represents an untenable distortion of judicial priorities and a grave miscarriage of administrative justice that must be immediately rectified by the supervisory intervention of the Chief Justice.

PART V: ETHICAL IMPERATIVES AND THE DISCIPLINARY MANDATE
--

17. This systemic obfuscation and the resultant administrative stasis directly engage the rigorous ethical mandates delineated within the *Ethical Principles for Judges* (2023) and the explicit oversight mechanisms codified in *Judicial Conduct: A Reference Guide for Chief Justices* (2018) and the *Procedures for the Review of Complaints or Allegations About Federally Appointed Judges* (Review Procedures 2023). The integrity of the judicial system is inextricably predicated upon the unimpeachable adherence to these ethical frameworks by all adjudicative officers and their administrative delegates. When the administrative arm of the court operates in defiance of

statutory production requirements, it reflects profoundly upon the ethical oversight of the presiding judiciary and necessitates immediate, corrective administrative action.

18. The *Ethical Principles* demand unwavering, perpetual adherence to judicial independence, integrity, and impartiality. Principle 1.A.4 explicitly dictates that preserving the constituent elements of judicial independence is critical to the public’s perception of impartiality, and that unethical conduct, opacity, or the appearance of administrative capture erodes the foundation of the rule of law. Furthermore, Principle 3.B.1 mandates that all judicial duties must be performed in a timely, diligent manner. The failure to properly adjudicate matters or to compel the production of records, as illuminated in the exhaustive CJC inquiry concerning *Dugré c. Canada (Attorney General)*, 2019 FC 1604 (the “*Dugré*”), confirms that the office of a judge imposes a positive duty to act and decide. In *Dugré*, the failure in the due execution of judicial office was defined not merely by erroneous adjudication, but by systemic inaction and the failure to provide the fundamental outputs of the judicial process to the very litigants reliant upon them. Administrative paralysis, sustained documentary deprivation, and the failure in the due execution of judicial office functionally dismantle the adjudicative process, fundamentally undermine public confidence, and construct a *prima facie* basis for a finding of misconduct, necessitating immediate, corrective directives from the Chief Justice to restore the unassailable integrity of the tribunal. The judiciary cannot passively observe the administrative suppression of its own *acta* without becoming complicit in the deprivation of rights.

PART VI: THE THIRTEEN CONSTITUTIONAL DUTIES OF THE PRIMUS INTER PARES
--

19. Since the 1995 adjudication by the Supreme Court of Canada in *Ruffo v. Conseil de la magistrature*, [1995] 4 S.C.R. 267 (the “*Ruffo*”), the doctrine of *primus inter pares* (the “**Primus Inter Pares**”, or first among equals) has emerged as a substantive, actionable designation of ultimate institutional accountability, transcending mere ceremonial seniority. As subsequently explicitly affirmed by the Federal Court of Appeal in *Canadian Judicial Council v. Girouard*, 2019 FCA 148, the power to unilaterally lay disciplinary complaints against colleagues is an intrinsic, non-delegable part of the Chief Justice’s heavy responsibility in addressing ethical issues and regulating

the roster. It is respectfully submitted that you, in your capacity as the Chief Justice of the Superior Court of Justice, possess an inherent, plenary suite of responsibilities (collectively, the “**13 Chief Justice Duties**”) which must now be robustly exercised to cure this localized administrative failure. The failure to exercise these duties in the face of documented spoliation effectively cedes the core jurisdiction of the tribunal to the administrative state. These duties include:

- a. ultimate jurisdiction (the “**Ultimate Jurisdiction**”): The definitive, overarching authority over both adjudicative and administrative functions, preventing the dangerous fragmentation of power across disparate regional registries and ensuring the *status quo ante* is immediately preserved against *ultra vires* deviation or rogue action by subordinate clerks. This authority must be actively utilized to command the immediate release of the withheld records, overriding any localized administrative recalcitrance or unauthorized bureaucratic gatekeeping that subverts the appellate process;
- b. constitutional trust stewards (the “**Constitutional Trust Stewards**”): The non-delegable responsibility to serve as the primary, unyielding guardian of the constitutional trust bestowed by the citizenry, strictly prohibiting any judicial complicity with executive secrecy, law enforcement overreach, or opaque administrative withholding that fractures the social contract betwixt the public and the bench;
- c. imperviously influenced mandate (the “**Imperviously Influenced Mandate**”): The strict requirement to remain completely impervious to external influences, shielding the tribunal from political maneuvering, media pressure, or systemic administrative capture (see: *Faber c. R.*, 2015 QCCS 12 (the “*Faber*”), paragraph 111, underscoring the absolute necessity of institutional fortitude against state encroachment). This duty requires the Chief Justice to actively investigate any algorithmic intrusion into the court’s secure ecosystem;
- d. master of the roster (the “**Master of the Roster**”): The absolute, unassailable authority over the scheduling, assignment, and equitable distribution of judicial resources, specifically preventing unaccountable judicial silos or the clandestine assumption of criminal jurisdiction by jurists improperly seated in the family division to synthesize extra-legal warrants beyond the purview of traditional, auditable oversight mechanisms;
- e. self-assignment power (the “**Self-Assignment Power**”): The inherent, affirmative authority to seize carriage of or self-assign matters of profound institutional significance where the overarching reputation of the tribunal is placed at imminent risk by jurisdictional anomalies, widespread administrative failure, or the systemic obfuscation of the foundational *acta*;
- f. administrative steward (the “**Administrative Steward**”): The rigorous duty to oversee, audit, and command clerical and registry functions pursuant to section 76 of the *Courts of Justice Act*, ensuring the administrative arm does not descend into bureaucratic lawlessness, technological spoliation, or the refusal of constitutionally mandated public service to accused persons;
- g. institutional reputation guardian (the “**Institutional Reputation Guardian**”): The uncompromising obligation to serve as the stalwart protector of the Court’s standing in the public eye, demanding immediate, transparent rectification of any localized conduct, algorithmic manipulation, or document suppression casting a pall upon the perceived impartiality, competence, and integrity of the judicature;
- h. efficiency operation duty (the “**Efficiency Operation Duty**”): The overarching responsibility to ensure the seamless, lawful operation of all Court functions, commanding the immediate resolution of administrative stasis and the forthwith production of unlawfully withheld *acta* to prevent the stagnation of constitutionally protected appellate review mechanisms and the denial of fundamental justice;

- i. ethical compliance guarantee (the “**Ethical Compliance Guarantee**”): The occupation of a paramount, supervisory position to actively guarantee absolute compliance with judicial ethics within the tribunal, ensuring that no jurist operates *coram non judice* or enables the fabrication of process through unauthorized *ex parte* chamber proceedings entirely devoid of mandatory transcription or public accessibility;
- j. complaint laying power (the “**Complaint Laying Power**”): The intrinsic, affirmative authority, as recognized in *Ruffo* and affirmed in *Girouard*, to initiate formal disciplinary complaints to external oversight bodies (such as the CJC) where egregious ethical breaches, deliberate spoliation of the judicial record, or severe jurisdictional usurpations are incontrovertibly identified. This power is central to the self-regulating nature of the judiciary and must be exercised to insulate the institution from the misconduct of individual actors;
- k. puisne judge removal power (the “**Puisne Judge Removal Power**”): The administrative authority and concurrent duty to relieve, restrict, or reassign a colleague from specific judicial duties during the pendency of serious ethical inquiries to prevent further adjudicative contamination, mitigate public scandal, and preserve the absolute integrity of the roster until the cloud of suspicion is definitively resolved;
- l. moral barometer (the “**Moral Barometer**”): The solemn role of serving as the absolute ethical and integrity barometer for the entire judicial institution, setting the incontrovertible standard for professionalism, transparent record-keeping, and legal fidelity across all judicial districts, demanding that opacity be replaced with immediate disclosure; and
- m. moral authority (the “**Moral Authority**”): The power to impose judicial will and ethical rectitude upon registry officials, delegates, and subordinate staff through the strategic exercise of moral authority for the collective good, ensuring that judicial privilege and immunity are utilized strictly to protect the administration of justice for the benefit of the public, as recently affirmed in *R. v. Swaine, 2025 ONCA 614*, and the absolute preservation of the rule of law against state-sponsored obfuscation and algorithmic manipulation.

PART VII: CONCLUDING IMPERATIVES AND FORMAL REQUISITION

20. In light of the aforementioned incontrovertible forensic realities, the stringent jurisprudential dictates of the Supreme Court of Canada, and the unyielding framework of policies established by the Canadian Judicial Council, it is strictly requisitioned that the Chief Justice execute the constitutional duties vested within the *Primus Inter Pares*. The sustained administrative recalcitrance and documentary spoliation exhibited by the Originating Court Office can no longer be tolerated as a mere clerical delay or bureaucratic oversight; it has metastasized into a fundamental, actionable challenge to the constitutional integrity, the transparency, and the core jurisdiction of the Superior Court of Justice itself. The judicature cannot function as a silent partner in the deprivation of constitutional liberties.
21. Returning to the absolute vanguard of this document, the superseding objective must be reiterated with unyielding finality: the Chief Justice is formally required to unconditionally direct the administrative apparatus to produce the unadulterated, natively generated Form 2 Information, the Form 4 Indictment, and all associated Endorsements to

the Applicant by no later than 5:00 p.m. tomorrow, July 20, 2026. This temporal mandate is the absolute, non-negotiable metric of institutional compliance and the requisite minimum to cure the continuing, egregious breach of procedural fairness and constitutional propriety.

22. Definitive and unyielding compliance with this temporal mandate—satisfying the rigid strictures of the *Administration of Justice Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. A.6 and the explicit fee-exemption provisions of the *Superior Court of Justice and Court of Appeal - Fees*, O. Reg. 293/92—is anticipated forthwith. The delivery of these foundational records by the expiration of the business day tomorrow remains the absolute baseline for institutional remediation. The undersigned again reiterates his sincerest congratulations upon your appointment to this esteemed office, trusting implicitly that your decisive, corrective intervention herein will serve as a foundational hallmark of your tenure in decisively restoring the unimpeachable integrity, absolute transparency, and unassailable dignity of the Court. Your time is recognized as a scarce and valuable judicial resource, yet this decisive action is the fundamental, imperative first step toward justice.

23. It is therefore respectfully requested that your office remit a response containing, at the absolute minimum, the natively generated Form 2 Information or Form 4 Indictment by the conclusion of the present business day. Should the complete fulfillment of this entire requisition prove administratively impracticable within this exacting temporal parameter, it is strictly required that you formally advise the undersigned of the precise date and time by which full production will be effectuated. Such transparent communication is imperative to ensure the efficient, responsible allocation of the public purse and to preclude the necessity of further collateral litigation, prerogative writ applications, and the corresponding expenditure of scarce judicial resources.

24. For the facilitation of immediate review and the uncompromising preservation of the unassailable factual matrix, the following evidentiary substrates have been meticulously appended hereto and incorporated by reference in their entirety, with specific pagination referring to the compiled document entitled “Appendices A to D_pagenumber - Evidence - Request CJ SCJ Boucher.pdf”, and the supplementary “Appendix E - Grape City Chart Analysis_pagenumber.pdf”:

- a. Appendix A: Evidentiary electronic correspondence exchanged with the Originating Court Office establishing the protracted timeline of unanswered formal requisitions, the administrative paralysis, and the flagrant breach of the duty of honest performance (see: Evidentiary Record, pp. 1-42);
- b. Appendix B: The pro-forma CCO-2 information package establishing the authentic architectural baseline, the required statutory formatting, and the mandatory jurat locations for a lawful Form 2 Information (see: Evidentiary Record, pp. 43-49);
- c. Appendix C: The False Information Package illustrating the profound structural, jurisdictional, and cryptographic anomalies deployed to bypass criminal oversight, including the illegitimate utilization of the FRANK architecture (see: Evidentiary Record, pp. 50-55);
- d. Appendix D: The evidentiary electronic correspondence confirming the profound absence of the mandatory foundational *acta* alongside the explicit, documented admission by the Recording Management Office of *ex parte* chamber proceedings entirely devoid of transcription or public access (see: Evidentiary Record, pp. 56-106); and
- e. Appendix E: The GrapeCity Forensic Analysis containing the exhaustive vector morphology breakdown, DOC-6507 whitespace vulnerability mapping, algorithmic “stem shearing,” and the specific application errors incontrovertibly substantiating the deliberate digital synthesis, structural corruption, and algorithmic stitching of the *acta* (see: Appendix E - Grape City Chart Analysis, pp. 107-111).

25. I trust you will agree with me that this type of conduct can never happen again. There is a never a wrong time to do the right thing, and doing the “right thing” is required.

26. Thank you for your time in advance and I await to hear from you on or before Monday, July 20, 2026, at five p.m. – positively or negatively.

Respectfully submitted,



Mr. Kevin A. McLean (BA, JD, CIM)

Email: mclean@searchandseizure.ca

Copied to internally: mcleansettlement@gmail.com

Enclosures:

Appendices A, B, C, D (Evidentiary Record, pp. 1-106), and Appendix E (Appendix E - Grape City Chart Analysis, pp. 107-111)