

Superior Court of Justice, Family Court

(Name of court)

Court File Number

FC-15-2446-0at **161 Elgin Street, Ottawa, Ontario K2P 2K1**

(Court office address)

**Form 17A:
Case Conference Brief -
General****Name of party filing this brief****Jonathan William Kiska****Date of case conference****February 25, 2021 @ 10:00 a.m.****Applicant(s)***Full legal name & address for service — street & number, municipality, postal code, telephone & fax numbers and e-mail address (if any).***Jonathan William Kiska
1244 Lampman Crescent
Ottawa, Ontario
K2C 1P8***Lawyer's name & address — street & number, municipality, postal code, telephone & fax numbers and e-mail address (if any).***Cheryl Hess
Bell, Baker
Barristers & Solicitors
700 - 116 Lisgar Street
Ottawa, Ontario K2P 0C2
Tel: 613-237-3444
Fax: 613-237-1413
chess@bellbaker.com****Respondent(s)***Full legal name & address for service — street & number, municipality, postal code, telephone & fax numbers and e-mail address (if any).***Deirdre Moore
215 Montreal Road
Ottawa, Ontario
K1L 6C8
Tel: 613-747-1011 / 613-848-6832

dw.cceh@outlook.com***Lawyer's name & address — street & number, municipality, postal code, telephone & fax numbers and e-mail address (if any).***PART 1: FAMILY FACTS**

1. **APPLICANT:** Age: 60 Birthdate: (d, m, y) September 29, 1960
2. **RESPONDENT:** Age: 55 Birthdate: (d, m, y) September 28, 1965
3. **RELATIONSHIP DATES:**
- ☒ Married on (date) July 22, 2000
- ☒ Separated on (date) October 9, 2015
- ☐ Started living together on (date) _____
- ☐ Never lived together
- ☐ Other (Explain.) _____

4. The basic information about the child(ren) is as follows:

Child's full legal name	Age	Birthdate (d, m, y)	Grade/Year and School	Now living with
Sean Charles Kiska	14	May 8, 2006	Merivale High School - grade 9 - French Immersion Program	Jonathan Kiska (Applicant Father)
Cate Stella Kiska	13	November 30, 2007	Merivale High School - grade 8 - French Immersion Program	Jonathan Kiska (Applicant Father)

PART 2: THE ISSUES

5. What are the issues in this case that **HAVE** been settled:

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> child custody | <input type="checkbox"/> spousal support | <input type="checkbox"/> possession of home |
| <input type="checkbox"/> access | <input type="checkbox"/> child support | <input type="checkbox"/> equalization of net family property |
| <input type="checkbox"/> restraining order | <input type="checkbox"/> ownership of property | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> other (<i>Specify.</i>) | | |

6. What are the issues in this case that have **NOT** yet been settled:

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> child custody | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> spousal support | <input type="checkbox"/> possession of home |
| <input type="checkbox"/> access | <input type="checkbox"/> child support | <input type="checkbox"/> equalization of net family property |
| <input type="checkbox"/> restraining order | <input type="checkbox"/> ownership of property | (Attach Net Family Property Statement, Form 13B) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> other (<i>Specify.</i>) | | |

1. Finalizing the interim order dated August 9, 2020.
2. Next steps to work towards finalization of this matter.
3. Costs.

7. If child or spousal support is an issue, give the income of the parties:

Applicant: \$ _____ per year for the year 20____
 Respondent: \$ _____ per year for the year 20____

8. Have you explored any ways to settle the issues that are still in dispute in this case?

- ☒ No. ☐ Yes. (*Give details.*)

9. Have any of the issues that have been settled turned into a court order or a written agreement?

- ☐ No.
☒ Yes. ☒ an order dated See Endorsements/Orders attached
☐ a written agreement that is attached.

10. Have the parents attended a family law or parenting education session?

- ☐ No. (*Should they attend one?*)

- ☐ Yes. (*Give details.*)

PART 3: ISSUES FOR THIS CASE CONFERENCE

11. What are the issues for this case conference? What are the important facts for this case conference?

Issues for this Case Management Conference as per the Endorsement of Justice MacEachern dated February 3, 2021:

1. Finalizing interim order of August 9, 2019.
2. Status of payment of support to the Respondent under the existing order.
3. Next steps to move this matter to a final resolution.
4. Costs of this case management conference.

Important Facts:

1. The CYFSA matter was resolved by the Order of Justice Fraser dated December 11, 2020 wherein pursuant to a Summary Judgement motion, the children were placed in the custody of the father, John Kiska (**see endorsement and order attached – Tab 1**).
2. The mother appealed that decision. We were before the Divisional Court on Feb 9th, 2021 wherein Justice Corbett allowed the mother to amend her Notice of Appeal and to make arrangements to order the transcripts. The matter has been adjourned to March 17, 2021 at 10 a.m. (**see e-mail attached – Tab 2**)
3. The CYFSA matter is now under appeal at the Divisional Court.
4. The matter was heard by Justice Engelking on August 9, 201 (**endorsement is attached – Tab 3**)
5. A draft order was provided to the mother (**See attached letter and draft order – Tab 4**). Child support is to be terminated as payable by the father. The mother does not pay child support for the children, however, has travelled extensively as can be seen by the attached emails etc. She has been to Mexico, Boston, America, Dublin Ireland to name a few (**see attached e-mails – Tab 5**). If she can travel extensively, she should be supporting the children. That order has never been signed nor issued with the court.
6. The support orders were filed with FRO, however the mother has withdrawn from FRO. She continues to state that she will not use FRO by any means.
7. There is an order with respect to child and spousal support. The order was the order of Justice Audet dated March 22, May 1, May 17 and September 7, 2018. Child support was to be \$345.00 per month payable by the father due to the set-off as at that time the children were in both homes. Spousal support was to be paid in the sum of \$1,230 per month (**see Order attached – Tab 6**). The father was paying the spousal support directly to the mother until February of 2020.
8. Attempts were made to pay the mother directly. However, the mother has been transient and has been moving all over the world. At one point cheques were sent to a hotel in Boston as that was the address provided by the mother, however, they were returned as she was not at this address (**see attached attempts to pay – Tab 7**).
9. In June of 2020, Mr. Kiska received notice from FRO that all support payments were to be made to that office. He did so and paid the sum of \$7,380.00 covering support from February 2020 to July 2020. (**See the FRO garnishment notice – Tab 8**)
10. There are criminal conditions and a restraining order – E-transfers cannot be done due to those conditions. Ms. Moore does not have criminal counsel. Ms. Moore would not confirm to FRO that she had received monies dating back to the initial order. Mr. Kiska received a Notice of Garnishment re the

Government of Canada (**See attached – Tab 9**). He understood that a tax refund would be sent to Ms. Moore.

11. On December 8, 2020 he received a letter from FRO stating that Ms. Moore had withdrawn from FRO.
12. In January of 2021, Ms. Moore commenced a Small Claims Court action requesting spousal support in the sum of \$7,380.00 from August 1, 2020 to January 1, 2021. Mr. Kiska has agreed to pay that amount to her as long as it does not affect the family proceedings. He had defended the Small Claims Court action. (**See the Claim and Defence – Tab 10 and 11**).
13. He wishes to have the payments made through FRO. The sum of \$8,610.00 is in the trust account of Bell Baker, ready to be paid out as long as the Small Claims Court action is dismissed. The Applicant is requesting an order that the support be paid through the Family Responsibility Office or in the alternative through the office of Bell Baker LLP via post-dated cheque, however a proper valid mailing address is required for the Respondent in order to do so.
14. The Applicant is requesting an order that the Office of the Children's Lawyer be appointed - a lawyer in order that the children's views and preferences are before the court for trial purposes. The children are now 14 and 13 years of age.
15. At the present time this matter cannot be placed on the trial list. We have to wait until the appeal before the Divisional Court is resolved and heard.

12. What is your proposal to resolve these issues?

1. The spousal support owed to the Respondent will be paid to her upon receipt of confirmation of the withdrawal of the Small Claims Court action.
2. Monthly support payments will be paid through the Family Responsibility Office or in the alternative through the office of Bell Baker LLP via post-dated cheques, provided a current, valid mailing address is provided for the Respondent.
3. The within action will be stayed pending the outcome of the CYFSA Divisional Court Appeal.
4. The Office of the Children's Lawyer will be appointed to represent the children in this matter.
5. The Respondent to pay the costs of the Applicant with respect to this Case Management Conference.

13. Do you want the court to make a temporary or final order at the case conference about any of these issues?

☐ No.

☒ Yes. (*Give details.*)

1. An order that the spousal support owed to the Respondent in the sum of \$7,380.00, currently held in the trust account of Bell Baker LLP, be paid to the Respondent upon receipt of confirmation of the withdrawal of the Small Claims Court action by Dierdre Moore.
2. An order that the support be paid through the Family Responsibility Office or in the alternative through the office of Bell Baker LLP via post-dated cheques.

3. An order that this matter be stayed until the determination of the CYFSA Divisional Court Appeal.
4. An order that the Office of the Children's Lawyer be appointed to represent the children to put their views and preferences before the court for trial purposes.
5. An order that the Respondent, Dierdre Moore, pay the costs of this Case Management Conference of the Applicant, on a full indemnity basis.

PART 4: FINANCIAL INFORMATION

NOTE: - If a claim for support has been made in this case, you must serve and file a new Financial Statement (Form 13 or 13.1), if it is different from the one filed in the continuing record or if the one in the continuing record is more than 30 days old. If there are minor changes but no major changes in your financial statement, you can serve and file an affidavit with details of the changes instead of a new financial statement. If you have not yet filed a financial statement in the continuing record, you must do it now. The page/tab number of the financial statement in the continuing record is _____

14. If a claim is being made for child support and a claim is made for special expenses under the Child Support Guidelines, give details of those expenses or attach additional information.
15. If a claim is made for child support and you claim that the Child Support Guidelines table amount should not be ordered, briefly outline the reasons here or attach an additional page.

PART 5: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

16. If custody or access issues are not yet settled:

(a) Is a custody or access assessment needed?

☒ No. ☐ Yes. (Give names of possible assessors.)

(b) Does a child or a parent under 18 years of age need legal representation from the Office of the Children's Lawyer?

☐ No. ☒ Yes. (Give details and reasons.)

The Applicant is requesting that the Office of the Children's Lawyer be appointed in order that the children's views and preferences are put before the court for trial purposes. The children are now 14 and 13 years of age.

17. Does any party need an order for the disclosure of documents, the questioning of witnesses, a property valuation or any other matter in this case?

☐ No. ☐ Yes. (Give details.)

Unknown at this time.

18. Are any other procedural orders needed?

☐ No. ☐ Yes. (Give details.)

Unknown at this time.

19. Have all the persons who should be parties in this case been added as parties?

☒ Yes. ☐ No. (Who needs to be added?)

20. Are there issues that may require expert evidence or a report?

☒

No.

☐

Yes. (If yes, provide details such as: the type of expert evidence; whether the parties will be retaining a joint expert; who the expert will be; who will be paying the expert; how long it will take to obtain a report, etc.)

21. Are there any other issues that should be reviewed at the case conference?

☒

No.

☐

Yes. (Give details.)

Date of party's signature

February 19, 2021

Date of lawyer's signature

Signature of party

Cheryl Hess

Signature of party's lawyer

TAB 1

TO CASE CONFERENCE BRIEF OF JONATHAN KISKA

WARNING

This is a case under the *Child, Youth and Family Services Act, 2017* and subject to subsection 87(8) and 87(9) of this legislation. These subsections and subsection 142(3) of the *Child, Youth and Family Services Act, 2017*, which deals with the consequences of failure to comply, read as follows:

87(8) Prohibition re identifying child — No person shall publish or make public information that has the effect of identifying a child who is a witness at or a participant in a hearing or the subject of a proceeding, or the child's parent or foster parent or a member of the child's family.

(9) Prohibition re identifying person charged — The court may make an order prohibiting the publication of information that has the effect of identifying a person charged with an offence under this Part.

142(3) Offences re publication — A person who contravenes subsection 87(8) or 134(11) (publication of identifying information) or an order prohibiting publication made under clause 87(7)(c) or subsection 87(9), and a director, officer or employee of a corporation who authorizes, permits or concurs in such a contravention by the corporation, is guilty of an offence and on conviction is liable to a fine of not more than \$10,000 or to imprisonment for a term of not more than three years, or to both.

CITATION: CAS of Ottawa v. D.M. and J.K.
COURT FILE NO.: FC-19-CP8-1
DATE: 2020/12/11

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE - ONTARIO

RE: The Children's Aid Society of Ottawa, Applicant

AND:

D.M. and J. K, Respondents

BEFORE: Justice Mary A. Fraser

COUNSEL: Deborah Souder, for the Applicant

Wade Smith, for the Respondent, J.K.

D.M., self-represented

Deborah Scholey for Office of the Children's Lawyer

HEARD: November 10, 2020

ENDORSEMENT

- [1] As a result of COVID-19 which has caused the suspension of regular court operations at this time, as set out in the Notice to the Profession dated March 15, 2020 (available at <https://www.ontariocourts.ca/scj/covid-19-suspension-fam/>) this matter was heard by Zoom video conference.
- [2] The Applicant (the "Society") has brought a Motion for Summary Judgment on this Status Review Application pursuant to Rule 16 of the *Family Law Rules*. It asks for an order that there is no genuine issue for trial in this matter and that I grant summary judgment by finding that the children, S.K. born May 2006 and C. K. born November 2007 (the "children") who were found to be in need of protection pursuant to sections 74(2)(b)(i), 74(2)(b)(ii) and 74(2)(h) of the *Child, Youth and Family Services Act* (the "Act") by MacLeod J. on April 8, 2019, continue to be children in need of protection under the Act.
- [3] The Society asks for an order placing the children in the custody of the Respondent, J.K. (the "father") with access to the Respondent, D. M. (the "mother") at the discretion the father.

- [4] The father consents to the Order sought by the Society. He also brings a Motion asking for an Order pursuant to section 137 of the Act restraining the mother from, among other things, attending within 500 m of his residence.
- [5] Ms. Deborah Scholey is counsel for the children. She supports both the Society and the father in their respective motions.
- [6] The mother asks for the return of the children to her sole custody.
- [7] The mother also presently brings a cross motion seeking, among other things, a restraining Order against the father.

Background Facts:

- [8] The mother and the father were married on July 22, 2000. They separated for the last time on November 27, 2016. A domestic proceeding was commenced and on December 13, 2016, the parents entered into an Interim Parenting Agreement by which the parents agreed to a 2-2-3 shared parenting arrangement.
- [9] The domestic proceeding continued was ongoing when the protection proceeding was started.
- [10] There is a long history of involvement by the Society as a result of the mother's mental health concerns. She was diagnosed with bipolar affective disorder in 2013. The Society maintains that the mother has been "formed" on a number of occasions. The mother does not dispute her history of mental health issues and hospitalizations. She does dispute the specific diagnosis of bipolar affective disorder.
- [11] The Society's most recent involvement began in January 2019.
- [12] The children have resided with the father since being brought to a place of safety on February 1, 2019.
- [13] On April 8, 2019, MacLeod J. made statutory findings on the children and found them to be in need of protection. He made a Final Order placing the children in the care of their father subject to the supervision of the Society for a period of four months on terms and conditions, with access to the mother at the discretion of the Society and in accordance with the children's wishes.
- [14] MacLeod J. also made a final restraining order against the mother, pursuant to section 137 of the Act specifying that : 1) the mother shall not attend within 500m of the father's residence; 2) the mother shall not attend within 500m of the children's schools, unless with the written pre-approval of the Society; 3) the mother shall not communicate with the children by any means without the father's supervision; and 4) the mother shall not have any physical contact or access with the children, except fully supervised access at the discretion of the Society.

- [15] Mohammed Said, the Society worker, in his Affidavit sworn October 19, 2020, outlines that D.M. has and continues to present as paranoid, with a pervasive belief that there is a conspiracy between the father, the Society, the police and judiciary to deprive her of her children and that her children are being physically and emotionally abused by the father, aided and abetted by the Society.
- [16] The mother has sent numerous emails directed to numerous community members, politicians, police officers and health professionals throughout this proceeding. These communications relate her belief that she is being targeted, "gang stalked," and terrorized by the father. The mother, in these communications, threatens to take civil action and pursue criminal prosecution against the various professionals who have had involvement with the family in this and related proceedings.
- [17] On January 31, 2019, the Society received emails from the mother, copied to the Ottawa Police Service, the children's school, a city counsellor and a mental health care provider. These emails warned that if anything happened to the mother or the children, they were to know that it was likely that the father was not solely responsible. She stated that she would attempt to distribute as many photos of the people who have been following her as possible. Due to this as well as concerns respecting the mother's mental health during the resulting in-person visit with her, led to the Society's decision to bring the children to a place of safety.
- [18] The Society reached out to the mother's previously identified medical and psychiatric supports to learn that the mother was not in contact nor receiving treatment and that she was likely not taking her medication.
- [19] On February 6, 2019, a temporary Without Prejudice Order was made placing the children in the care and custody of the father with the mother's access being at the discretion of the Society and in accordance with the children's wishes. On February 17, 2019 this Order became a "With Prejudice Order" on the same terms.
- [20] The mother has not cooperated with the Society since this file was opened.
- [21] Following the children being brought to a place of safety, the mother did not acknowledge or comply with the terms restricting her access to the children. She contacted the father and the school persistently and the mother would also simply show up demanding to see the children during this time.
- [22] In the spring of 2019, the mother traveled to Montreal. She was arrested and incarcerated for fleeing from a Peace Officer. She was detained in jail in Quebec for over a month.
- [23] On July 27, 2019, the mother was arrested. She had broken into the father's house. She was charged with criminal harassment, break and enter/unlawfully in a dwelling (the father's home). In total she was facing five charges: two criminal harassment charges, two mischief charges and one charge of breaching a court order.
- [24] She was then "in custody" again from July 29, 2019 to some point in the late summer of 2019. It is noted that these charges were due to proceed to a trial in early December 2019.

However, they were delayed as the criminal court ordered the completion of an assessment to determine if the mother was criminally responsible for her acts.

- [25] Upon the mother's release from custody, she remained in Ottawa for a short period of time but then she left the country for the United States. She also travelled to other countries. It appears she remained out of the country for the most part until August 2020.
- [26] The mother has refused to cooperate with the Society to address its protection concerns. Since February 2019, there has been little if any engagement by her. The Society has also provided an extensive history of communications from the mother which it submits support the conclusion that the mother suffers paranoid and irrational thinking.
- [27] The mother has been unwilling to meet with workers even when she is in Ottawa and meetings have been unproductive. She has denied receiving emails and phone calls from them and at one point suggested that Bell was hacking her email and phones. When invited to meet to discuss access with the children, the mother declined because she was busy working on "criminal charges" against the worker and the Society stating that there was a possibility of collusion. Attempts to contact the mother by attending at her home have been met with accusations that the worker has been stalking her.
- [28] In December 2019, the mother met with the worker and was provided a list of parenting programs which, at the time, she was prepared to take in an effort to work cooperatively with the Society. The mother did not follow through and when contacted by the worker in March 2020, she accused him of being a terrorist and denied ever receiving a list of parenting courses from anyone.
- [29] The mother has accused the Society of "illegally apprehending" her two children. She states that the worker illegally committed "criminal defamation, perjury and multiple crimes related to the fabrication of evidence and false affidavits."
- [30] The mother has claimed that she has alerted the American authorities and has additionally reached out to authorities in Ireland, the United Kingdom, as well as the Canadian Embassy about what she termed the "group's wicked practices."
- [31] In April 2020, there was contact between the worker and the mother who advised she was in Mexico. The worker advised the mother that the children were doing well. The worker inquired whether the mother was seeing a psychiatrist or other mental health professional and expressed an interest in knowing what her status was so that discussions could take place with respect to contact with the children. In response, the mother told the worker that he was "more like a sociopath than a human being" and provided several reasons why he has not been arrested yet.
- [32] The mother is maintaining a website under an assumed name which is in aid of supporting others who find themselves married to a "narcissist." On this website she has been publishing photos of the children and documents relating to the child protection proceedings. The Society has expressed its concern to the mother that the publication of these materials is harmful and upsetting to the children, given they are aware of the materials and so are their peers. The mother refuses to remove this material.

- [33] The Society is likewise concerned that the mother persists in forwarding email communications to its workers respecting matters unrelated to the child protection matter and she is disseminating to numerous individuals unrelated to this proceeding, information concerning the child protection issues.

Attempts to Arrange Access:

- [34] The Society reached out to the mother in order to arrange and facilitate access with the children shortly following the children being brought to a place of safety. It was initially arranged that the mother would have access on Wednesday evenings for an hour, supervised by the Society. However, the mother advised that she wanted nothing to do with the Society. Attempts by the Society to engage the mother and address the issue of access were usually met with no response.
- [35] On May 16, 2019, the mother contacted the Society and asked for an access visit to be arranged. The Society suggested a meeting in order to get access started. The mother did not attend at the designated meeting time.
- [36] On May 31, 2019, the mother contacted the Society and advised she was not in Ottawa until the following week. She asked for a meeting on June 6, 2019 so that she could have access with the children on June 7, 2019. In her communication, she asked that the children have their passports with them when they came in for a visit in case the police are ready to arrest J.K then.
- [37] On June 11, 2019 the mother left the worker a message stating "It's...Tuesday morning, June 11, 9:01 a.m. Let's see. I could be in Ottawa tonight if I chose to but I will probably hang back because I am working on a couple of lawsuits. Your name is all over one of them."
- [38] The worker sent an e-mail message offering to schedule a visit once the mother returned to Ottawa. Eventually, after much back and forth, a meeting was scheduled for June 26, 2019.
- [39] On June 26, 2019, the mother arrived at the Society. She presented herself to security and then went to the parking lot and video recorded the staff's licence plates.
- [40] The mother indicated she was going to record the meeting despite a request that she not do so. The rules respecting the visit were reviewed with her. The mother was then asked, prior to seeing the children, to turn off both of the phones she had with her and to leave them with security. She was told that if she would not leave her phones with security, her visit would not happen. The mother continued to video record and refused to accede to this request. The visit was therefore cancelled. The mother would not then leave the lobby and security called the police. The mother ultimately left the building before the police arrived.
- [41] The mother has not exercised any access with the children since February 2019.

Status of the Mother's Mental Health:

- [42] The mother continues to maintain that this proceeding has been brought about through the father's fabrications and the Society's willingness to accept his evidence.
- [43] She does not dispute that she has been challenged with mental health issues. She maintains, however, that her mental illness has been situational. It began, she claims, when she had her first psychotic breakdown in March 2013 "in response to the father's severe emotional and psychological abuse of her."
- [44] The mother, for reasons she blames on the father, advises that she is presently homeless and in a "state of poverty."
- [45] In 2014, the mother states that a psychiatrist, Dr. Gilles Fleury of the Montfort Hospital provided a diagnosis of "Acute Adjustment Disorder" which the mother states is a situational mental disorder caused by acute stress.
- [46] In 2015, the mother relates that a psychiatrist, Dr. Gary Kay of the Ottawa Hospital acknowledged that her previous diagnosis of bi-polar disorder was incorrect and that he changed her diagnosis to Psychosis NOS.
- [47] In 2017, the mother asserts that a psychiatrist, Dr. Iris Jackson, fine-tuned Dr. Kay's 2015 Psychosis NOS diagnosis to Brief Psychotic Disorder with marked stressors.
- [48] In 2018, the mother states that a psychiatrist, Dr. Deanna Mercer, of the Ottawa Hospital stated that "she has brief psychotic episodes related to the stress she has experienced."
- [49] According to the mother, her correct diagnosis is psychosis NOS (not otherwise specified). She does not dispute that she has had multiple hospitalizations in the past for psychotic episodes.
- [50] The mother has not produced any evidence to suggest that she is presently receiving support or treatment from mental health professionals.

The Children's Lawyer:

- [51] The Children's Lawyer advises that the children do not wish to return to their mother's care at this time. While the children are hopeful that some day they will be able to resume a relationship with her, they have been impacted by her mental health issues and they are to some extent fearful of her given their awareness of her past irrational behaviour. Sadly, they have been impacted and traumatized by the some of the mother's actions. At present, the children wish to remain with their father. They support the father's request for a restraining order.

The Law:

- [52] Summary judgment motions are brought under Rule 16 of the Family Law Rules. Subsections (6) and (6.1) of that Rule provides as follows:

(6) *NO ISSUE FOR TRIAL* – If there is no genuine issue requiring a trial of a claim or defence, the court shall make a final order accordingly.

(6.1) *POWERS* – In determining whether there is a genuine issue requiring a trial, the court shall consider the evidence submitted by the parties, and the court may exercise any of the following powers for the purpose, unless it is in the interest of justice for such powers to be exercised only at a trial:

1. *Weighing the evidence,*

2. *Evaluating the credibility of the deponent.*

3. *Drawing any reasonable inference from the evidence.*

- [53] In *Hryniak v. Mauldin*, 2014 SCC 7, [2014] 1 S.C.R. 87, the Supreme Court of Canada set out a two-step process for determining whether summary judgment should be granted. The judge must first determine if there is a genuine issue requiring a trial based on the evidence without using the fact-finding powers set out in subsection 6.1. If, after this initial determination, there still appears to be a genuine issue for trial, the judge may resort to the fact-finding powers to decide if a trial is required.
- [54] The Court in *Hryniak* (at para. 49) held that in the context of a child protection case, there will be no genuine issue requiring a trial when the judge concludes that a fair and just determination can be reached on the merits on a motion for summary. This will be the case when the process (1) allows the judge to make the necessary finding of fact, (2) allows the judge to apply the law to the fact, and (3) is a proportionate, more expeditious and less expensive means to achieve a just result.
- [55] In *Kawartha Haliburton Children's Aid Society v. M.W.*, 2019 ONC 316 (at para. 63), the Ontario Court of Appeal held that the standard for fairness is not whether the procedure is as exhaustive as a trial but whether it gives the judge confidence that he/she can find the necessary facts and apply the relevant legal principles to resolve the dispute.
- [56] In a child protection proceeding, a fair and just determination on the merits must acknowledge that such proceedings engage *Charter* rights for a vulnerable segment of our society. As a consequence, a judge must take a cautious approach to motions of this nature in the context of a child protection proceeding.
- [57] That said, the genuineness of an issue must arise from something more than a parent's heartfelt expression of his desire to resume care of the children. The parent's evidence must support that the parent faces better prospects than what existed at the time the society removed the children from his/her care.
- [58] On a Status Review Application pursuant to subsections 113 to 116 of the Act, the Court must first determine whether the children continue to be in need of protection. The Court must consider the degree to which the risk concerns that formed the basis for the original order still exist. The need for continued protection may arise from the existence or absence of circumstances that triggered the original order for protection; or from circumstances

which have arisen since then. (See: *Children's Aid Society of Hamilton v. S* (B.L.) 2014 CarswellOnt 12921 (Ont. S.C.J.).

- [59] Under s. 114 of the Act, the Court, on a Status Review Application, must then determine what order is in the best interests of the children.

Analysis:

- [60] The evidence in this matter clearly shows that the mother has, and continues to be, unable to meet the needs of the children. She has been completely focussed on her perception that the father and the Society have conspired against her.
- [61] While the mother admits to mental health issues, she sadly demonstrates little, if any, insight into how these issues impact her ability to assume the care of the children.
- [62] Her unwillingness to address her mental health issues has resulted in one and one-half years passing with her taking little apparent action to improve her ability to resume the care of her children. She continues, it seems, to live a chaotic, unstable lifestyle. She does not have a home for the children. She has had multiple brushes with the law. Some of the criminal charges appear to remain outstanding.
- [63] The mother has chosen to wage her dispute with the father in a public forum by sharing her issues on her website and she has shared information which invades the children and the father's right to privacy. This is harmful for the children. The mother remains unwilling to remove this material from public view.
- [64] The children have not seen their mother since February 2019. The mother has spent large portions of her time in custody, in hospital or out of the county. She has not made any real effort whatsoever to see the children over the past year and she does not demonstrate any awareness of the impact her absence has had on her children.
- [65] The mother has not engaged with the Society workers to work toward a return of the children to her care. She has remained resistant and combative to the Society's involvement.
- [66] The mother has not sought out psychiatric treatment when it would otherwise seem appropriate for her to do so. She appears to have made no significant progress, if any at all, during this proceeding in managing her mental health issues. If, as the mother claims, her mental health does not presently impact her ability to provide for the proper care of the children, she has not provided any evidence to support her position, when it would be appropriate and indeed incumbent on her to do so.
- [67] Unfortunately, the mother's plan is at best an "idea." The mother has not put forward any real plan. She asks that the children be returned to her when she has no home or services set up for the children. She does not appear to have the financial ability to support her children.

- [68] Based upon the evidence before me, I conclude that a return to the mother's care would expose the children to a significant risk of serious emotional or physical harm. The children continue to be children in need of protection under the Act.
- [69] The children are clearly stable and content in the care and custody of the father. They wish to remain with him.
- [70] The granting of a custody order would terminate the Society's legal involvement. However, the mother's parental rights would not terminate with such a disposition. The custody/access issues will continue to be governed by what is in the best interests of the children and it does not foreclose the mother from pursuing such issues in the future.
- [71] I find that it is in the best interests of the children that they be placed in the custody of the father at this time pursuant to section 102 of the Act. Access to the mother should be in the discretion of the father.
- [72] There is no genuine issue requiring trial in this matter in this Status Review Application for me to come to that conclusion. The evidence before me makes it clear that the children cannot be safely returned to their mother's care, not even under a Supervision Order. The children should not have to wait any longer to have the issues in this proceeding determined. There is no realistic possibility that the mother's plan of care will be successful. It is clear that it is in their best interests to be placed in the custody of their father at this time.
- [73] I conclude, based upon the evidence before me, that an Order should issue granting the father's request for a restraining order.
- [74] Finally, based upon the evidence before, I do not find that the mother is entitled to the relief sought in her notice of motion and I decline to grant such relief.
- [75] For the above reasons, an Order shall go as follows:
- a. Summary judgment is granted pursuant to Rule 16 of the *Family Law Rules* as follows:
 - i. The children continue to be in need of protection under s. 74(2)(b)(i), 74(2)(b)(ii) and 74(2)(h) of the Act;
 - ii. The children shall be placed in the custody of the father with access to the mother at the father's discretion;
 - iii. The mother shall be restrained, pursuant to s. 137 of the Act, as follows:
 - A. The mother shall not attend within 500m of the residence of the father;
 - B. The mother shall not attend within 500m of the children's schools, unless prior approval is obtained in writing from the father;

C. The mother shall not communicate with the children by any means (electronic, telephone etc.) without the supervision of the father;

D. This restraining order shall be enforceable by the Ottawa Police Service (OPS), the Ontario Provincial Police (OPP), the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP), or any other police service within its jurisdiction;

E. This restraining order shall remain in force unless it is varied, extended or terminated by the court.

iv. The dates scheduled for the trial of this matter in January 2021 shall be vacated.



M. Fraser J.

Date: December 11, 2020



Superior Court of Justice of Ontario

(Name of court)

Court File Number
FC-19-CP000008 -1

at **161 Elgin Street, Ottawa, Ontario, K2P 2K1**

Court office address

**Form 25: Order
(General)**

☐ Temporary
☒ Final

the Honourable
Justice Fraser

Judge (print or type
name)

December 11, 2020

Date of order

Applicant(s)

Full legal name & address for service- street & number, municipality, postal code, telephone & fax numbers and e-mail address (if any).

The Children's Aid Society of Ottawa
1602 Telesat Court
Ottawa, Ontario
K1B 1B1
Canada
Phone: (613) 747-7800
Fax: (613) 747-1933

Lawyer's name & address - street & number, municipality, postal code, telephone & fax numbers and e-mail address (if any).

Deborah Souder
1602 Telesat Court
Ottawa, Ontario
K1B 1B1
Canada
Phone: (613) 747-7800 EXT. 2729
Fax: (613) 747-1933

Respondent(s)

Full legal name & address for service- street & number, municipality, postal code, telephone & fax numbers and e-mail address (if any).

Deirdre Moore
Address Confidential

Lawyer's name & address - street & number, municipality, postal code, telephone & fax numbers and e-mail address (if any).

Jonathan Kiska
1244 Lampman Crescent
Ottawa, Ontario
K2C 1P8
Tel: 613-794-5292

Wade Smith
700-116 Lisgar Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K2P 0C2
Tel: 613-237-3444
Fax: 613-237-1413
eMail: wsmith@bellbaker.com

Children's Lawyer

Name & address for service for Children's Lawyer agent - street & number, municipality, postal code, telephone & fax numbers and e-mail address (if any) and name of person represented.

Sean Kiska's Lawyer:
Debora Scholey
29-4338 Innes Road
Ottawa, Ontario
K4A 3W3
Tel: 613-424-0629
Fax: 613-482-4733
eMail: debora@scholey.ca

Cate Kiska's Lawyer:
Debora Scholey
29-4338 Innes Road

Ottawa, Ontario
K4A 3W3
Tel: 613-424-0629
Fax: 613-482-4733
eMail: debora@scholey.ca

The court heard an application made by *(name of person or persons)*
The Children's Aid Society of Ottawa.

The following persons were in court *(names of parties and lawyers in court)*
Deborah Souder, counsel for the Children's Aid Society of Ottawa; Deidre Moore, mother; Wade Smith, counsel for the father; Debora Scholey, counsel for the children.

The court received evidence and heard submissions on behalf of *(name or names)*
The Applicant, the Respondents and the Children.

THIS COURT ORDERS THAT:

- I. A restraining order is hereby granted against the mother, Deirdre Moore, pursuant to s. 137 of the *Child, Youth and Family Services Act*, as follows:
 1. The mother, Deirdre Moore, shall not attend within 500m of the residence of the father, John Kiska.
 2. The mother, Deirdre Moore, shall not attend within 500m of the children's schools, unless prior approval is obtained in writing by the father, John Kiska.
 3. The mother, Deirdre Moore, shall not communicate with the children Sean and Cate Kiska, by any means (electronic, telephone, etc) without the supervision of the father, John Kiska.
- II. This restraining order shall be enforced by the Ottawa Police Service (OPS), the Ontario Provincial Police (OPP), the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP), or any other police service within its jurisdiction.
- III. This restraining order shall remain in force unless it is varied, extended or terminated by the court.

December 14, 2020

Date of signature

J. Carroll

Signature of judge or clerk of the court

TAB 2

TO CASE CONFERENCE BRIEF OF JONATHAN KISKA

From: [Katherine Ghadaksaz](#)
To: [Katherine Ghadaksaz](#)
Subject: FW: (E - Region) - DEIRDRE MOORE and CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETY OF OTTAWA - FILE # 088/21
Date: February 18, 2021 2:35:39 PM
Importance: High

From: SCJ-CSJ Div Court Mail (JUD) <scj-csj.divcourtmail@ontario.ca>
Sent: February 11, 2021 11:38 AM
To: Deirdre Moore <dw.cceh@outlook.com>; 'Deborah.Souder@casott.on.ca' <Deborah.Souder@casott.on.ca>; Cheryl Hess <CHess@bellbaker.com>; Susan Galarneau <seg@galarneauassoc.com>
Cc: Senson, Patric (MAG) <Patric.Senson2@ontario.ca>; Baweja, Saurabh S. (JUD) <Saurabh.Baweja@ontario.ca>
Subject: (E - Region) - DEIRDRE MOORE and CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETY OF OTTAWA - FILE # 088/21
Importance: High

Hello all,

Justice Corbett directs me to advise you as follows:

The court confirms the case management teleconference held on February 9, 2021.

The following were in attendance at the teleconference:

Ms Moore - self represented appellant
Ms Souder - for the Ottawa CAS
Susan Galarneau - as agent for the OCL, and as agent for Ms Hess, counsel for the father

Ms Moore raised a concern about a lawyer representing the interests of the children also representing the interests of the father. The court reassured Ms Moore that there is nothing inappropriate with counsel acting as agent for another lawyer - even one representing different or contrary interests - for the purposes of a scheduling conference with a judge. There is no conflict of interest if all that is involved is providing scheduling availability to the court, as was the case here.

The court directs as follows:

1. The appellant may serve an amended notice of appeal by March 15, 2021.
2. The appellant may provide proof of transcripts having been ordered by March 15, 2021.
3. The appellant may serve an amended certificate of evidence by March 15, 2021.

I gave the appellant more time to complete these steps than would normally be the case because of several court obligations she has in other proceedings during February 2021.

There was a brief discussion about the nature of the record properly before this court on an appeal. Generally, the record is restricted to materials that were before the court below. The appellant has advised that she wishes to put additional materials before the court, including "fresh evidence". The additional evidence that the appellant wishes to put forward on the appeal should be listed in the appellant's certificate of evidence, and that issue will be canvassed at the next case management teleconference. The appellant says that she had been given to understand by court staff that a motion for fresh evidence is brought returnable before the panel hearing the appeal.

This issue can be addressed in that way, in an appropriate case, but this court will assess during the case management process whether issues respecting fresh evidence should be decided before the appeal hearing or at the hearing itself.

The next case management teleconference shall be held on March 17, 2021 at 10:00 am. It shall be before D.L. Corbett J., if I am available.

-

The call-in details are as follows:

Local Dial-In Number: 1- 866-500-5845

Conference I.D.: 6962433#

Please confirm.

-

Thank you.

*Best regards,
Rina Badwal*

*A/Single Judge Motions Coordinator
Divisional Court, Superior Court of Justice
Ministry of the Attorney General
Osgoode Hall
130 Queen Street West
Toronto, ON M5H 2N5
Phone: (416) 327-6202*

TAB 3

TO CASE CONFERENCE BRIEF OF JONATHAN KISKA

Bell Baker LLP

Barristers & Solicitors / Avocats & Notaires

116 LISGAR STREET, SUITE 700, OTTAWA, ONTARIO K2P 0C2

Phone 613-237-3444

Fax 613-237-1413

Wade L. Smith

613-237-3448 ext. 324

wsmith@bellbaker.com

www.bellbaker.com

August 12, 2019

Delivered by Facsimile

Deirdre Moore
Ottawa-Carleton Detention Centre

Dear Ms. Moore:

Re: Kiska and Moore
Court File No. FC-15-2446-0

As you are aware, this matter was to be brought back before Justice Engelking on August 9, 2019.

Attached is a copy of Justice Engelking's Endorsement wherein the family law matter has been removed from the September, 2019 trial sittings.

Yours truly,

BELL BAKER LLP

Wade L. Smith

WLS/ch

Encl.

c.c. John Kiska

James R. McNinch
Helmut R. Brodmann
James D. Wilson
Patricia A. Lawson

Geoffrey A. Howard
Wade L. Smith
James F. Leal
John Rick
Charlotte Watson

Martin D. Owens
Cheryl L. Hess
John E. Summers
Laura A. Hunt

Counsel: Paul A. Webber, Q.C.,
John C. Clarke, Q.C. (Ret'd), David C. Thompson, Q.C. (Ret'd)

COPY

Superior Court of Justice, Family Court

(Name of court / Nom du tribunal)

at / au 161 Elgin Street, Ottawa, ON K2P 2K1

(Municipality / Municipalité)

Court File Number / Numéro de dossier du greffe

FC-15-2446

Endorsement Sheet /

Page d'inscription

Date

Applicant(s) / Requérent(e)(s): Jonathan William Kiska ☒ Present / Comparaît

Counsel / Avocat(e): Wade Smith ☒ Present / Comparaît

☐ Duty Counsel /
Avocat de service

Respondent(s) / Intimé(e)(s): Darci Ann Moore ☐ Present / Comparaît

Counsel / Avocat(e): ☐ Present / Comparaît

☐ Duty Counsel /
Avocat de service

☐ Order to go in accordance with minutes of settlement or consent filed. /
Ordonnance conformément au procès-verbal de l'audience de transaction ou le consentement déposé.

Trial Management Conference

This was scheduled for a case management/
trial management meet w/ the parties,
however, the R. Ms Moore was recently
incarcerated and is not in attendance.
Additionally, the Children's Aid Society
of Ottawa, which has been involved
in this case for some time, has brought a
BRA for a custody order to the A,
Mr. Kiska, pursuant to s. 102 of
the CYFSA. On July 29, 2019, Justice
Audet made an endorsement staying
the custody & access aspects of this
case pending the completion of the
CYFSA proceedings. However, some of
the financial aspects of this case
are tied to the custody aspects

and it would not be efficient to proceed to trial by bifurcating the financial from the custody issues.

Therefore, the matter, is hereby removed from the Sept. 2019 trial sittings in Family Court and will proceed in CYFSA court.

Additionally, given the children are currently in Mr. Kuska's exclusive care, and have been for sometime, the child support payable to him to Ms. Moore pursuant to Justice Audet's order issued on Nov. 20, 2018 is hereby suspended,

without prejudice to Mr. Kuska to seek an adjustment for any period the children have been in his fulltime care prior to today.

The matter may be brought back to Family Court once the ~~the~~ CYFSA proceedings are concluded, if necessary.

Costs for today are reserved to the cause.

James L. G. /

TAB 4

TO CASE CONFERENCE BRIEF OF JONATHAN KISKA

Bell Baker LLP

Barristers & Solicitors / Avocats & Notaires

116 LISGAR STREET, SUITE 700, OTTAWA, ONTARIO K2P 0C2

Phone 613-237-3444

Fax 613-237-1413

Wade L. Smith

613-237-3448 ext. 324

wsmith@bellbaker.com

www.bellbaker.com

August 13, 2020

Delivered by Email Only

Deirdre Moore

Dear Ms. Moore:

Re: Kiska and Moore

Please find enclosed herein a draft of the Order of the Honourable Madam Justice Engelking dated August 9, 2019, together with Her Honour's Endorsement. Please approve this draft Order as to form and content, return it to the undersigned, and we will submit it to the Court to be issued and entered. Once we receive the signed Order from the Court we will provide you with a copy and also submit it to the Family Responsibility Office for enforcement.

We also enclose a Consent to the Temporary Order and would ask that you sign this and return it to the undersigned.

Yours truly,

BELL BAKER LLP

Wade L. Smith

WLS/ch

Encl.

c.c. John Kiska

Geoffrey A. Howard
Cheryl L. Hess
James D. Wilson
F. Alexis Hébert

James F. Leal
W. John Rick
Patricia A. Lawson
Laura A. Hunt

Helmut R. Brodmann
Wade L. Smith
John E. Summers
Charlotte A. Watson



ONTARIO
Superior Court of Justice, Family Court
(Name of Court)
at 161 Elgin Street, Ottawa, Ontario K2P 2K1
(Court office address)

Court File Number
FC-15-2446-0

Form 25: Order (General)

☒ **Temporary**
☐ **Final**

Applicant(s)

(Full legal name & address for service: street, number, municipality, postal code telephone & fax numbers & e-mail address (if any).)

Jonathan William Kiska
1244 Lampman Crescent
Ottawa, Ontario
K2C 1P8

Lawyer's name & address: street, number, municipality, postal code, telephone & fax numbers & e-mail address (if any).

Wade L. Smith
Bell Baker LLP
Barristers and Solicitors
700-116 Lisgar Street
Ottawa, Ontario K2P 0C2
Tel: (613) 237-3444
Fax: (613) 237-1413 Box#35
wsmith@bellbaker.com

The Honourable
Madam Justice
Engelking

Judge (Print or type name)

August 9, 2019
Date of order

Respondent(s)

(Full legal name & address for service: street, number, municipality, postal code telephone & fax numbers & e-mail address (if any).)

Deirdre Moore
dw.cceh@outlook.com

Lawyer's name & address: street, number, municipality, postal code, telephone & fax numbers & e-mail address (if any).

DRAFT

AT A TRIAL MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE

The following persons were in court (names of parties and lawyers in court)

The Applicant, Jonathan William Kiska, and his counsel, Wade L. Smith.

The Respondent, Deirdre Moore is self-represented and not in attendance.

The court received evidence and heard submissions on behalf of (name or names)

The parties

THIS COURT ORDERS THAT:

1. For reasons set out in my Endorsement of this date and attached to this Temporary Order, this matter is hereby removed from the September, 2019 trial sittings in the Family Court and will proceed in the CYFSA Court.
2. Given that the children, Sean Kiska, born May 8, 2006, and Cate Kiska, born November 30, 2007, are currently in the Applicant's, Johnathan William Kiska's exclusive care, child support payable by him to the Respondent, Deirdre Moore, pursuant to the Order of Justice Audet issued on November 20, 2018, is hereby suspended, without prejudice to the Applicant, Johnathan William Kiska, to seek an adjustment for any period the children have been in his fulltime care prior to today.
3. The matter may be brought back to Family Court once the CYFSA proceedings are concluded, if necessary.
4. Costs of today are reserved to the cause.

5. Unless the Support Order is withdrawn from the Office of the Director, Family Responsibility Office, it shall be enforced by the Director and amounts owing under the Support Order shall be paid to the Director, who shall pay them to the person to whom they are owed.

Put a line through any blank space left on this page.

Date of signature

Signature of judge or clerk of the court

Approved as to form and content

this 13 day of August, 2020

Per:

Wade L. Smith
BELL BAKER LLP

Approved as to form and content

this day of August, 2020.

Deirdre Moore, Respondent

ONTARIO

Superior Court of Justice, Family Court

(Name of Court)

Court File Number

FC-15-2446-0

at **161 Elgin Street, Ottawa, Ontario K2P 2K1**

(Court office address)

Applicant(s)

Full legal name & address for service — street & number, municipality, postal code, telephone & fax numbers and e-mail address (if any).

**Jonathan William Kiska
1244 Lampman Crescent
Ottawa, Ontario
K2C 1P8**

Lawyer's name & address — street & number, municipality, postal code, telephone & fax numbers and e-mail address (if any).

**Wade L. Smith
Bell Baker LLP
Barristers and Solicitors
700-116 Lisgar Street
Ottawa, Ontario K2P 0C2
Tel: (613) 237-3444
Fax: (613) 237-1413 Box#35
wsmith@bellbaker.com**

Respondent(s)

Full legal name & address for service — street & number, municipality, postal code, telephone & fax numbers and e-mail address (if any).

Deirdre Moore


Lawyer's name & address — street & number, municipality, postal code, telephone & fax numbers and e-mail address (if any).

Gonen Snir

CONSENT

The Applicant, by his lawyer, and the Respondent hereby consent to the issuing and entering of a Temporary Order in the form attached hereto.

Dated at Ottawa, Ontario this 12 day of August, 2020.



Wade L. Smith, Lawyer for
Jonathan William Kiska, Applicant

Dated at _____ this _____ day of August, 2020..

Deirdre Moore, Respondent

TAB 5

TO CASE CONFERENCE BRIEF OF JONATHAN KISKA

dw.cceh@outlook.com

From: Deirdre Moore <dw.cceh@outlook.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2020 10:01 AM
To: repadmin@justice.ie
Cc: Stephen.Gerry@dfa.ie; Grainne.Roughan@dfa.ie; Sarah.Callanan@dfa.ie; Deirdre Moore
Subject: Irish passport urgently required || Fwd: Resident of Ireland || Re: En route to Dublin || FW: Contact from Embassy of Ireland in Mexico
Attachments: image003.jpg

Hello,

Would you please inform me of how I might expedite the acquisition of an Irish passport? As detailed below, I am of Irish decent and therefore I have dual citizenship. As evidenced at www.pfi.rocks, I am currently enduring terrorism and persecution in Canada.

I first began attempting to obtain my Irish passport in Canada during June-July 2019; however, I have since been falsely accused of multiple crimes and detained without bail. In Canada, I have been robbed of most of my possessions, including my two children, my dog and my cat.

Due to the amount of bank-assisted fraud that I have endured, I do not have a credit or a debit card. I require a bank account in order to convert my cash into a card which will be accepted here in Ireland.

Currently residing at Jacob's Inn, 21-28 Talbot Pl, Mountjoy, Dublin 1, D01 W5P8, I am hoping that you will address your response to me as soon as possible so that I can at least open a bank account here in Dublin and secure safe accommodation during this coronavirus shutdown.

Thank you for any assistance that you are in a position to provide.

Deirdre Moore, CFA, BBA
President, SAQOTU Inc.
mobile: +353 (83) 324 5617 Ireland | (613) 791-0928 (inaccessible)
www.pfi.rocks

Sent from my iPhone

(613) 791-0928
for info & updates visit www.pfi.rocks

From: Deirdre Moore <dw.sceh@outlook.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 1, 2020 7:26 AM
To: Kevin Haggerty <khaggert@ualberta.ca>
Subject: United States || RE: SECOND REQUEST || RE: Connection

Sorry for the delay in my response: I had to shut down my computer.

I fled from Ottawa in March 2020; just days before COVID-19 started shutting everything down. To avoid be forced back to Ottawa, I went from Cuba to Madrid to Dublin to Mexico. I left Playa del Carmen just as Tropical Storm Cristobol was hitting the coast. I ended up flying to Atlanta which proved a difficult city for me to leave. I am still in the United States and feel safe: only the benevolent hackers know where I am.

Editor, Canadian Journal of Sociology
Department of Sociology
University of Alberta
Send proofs by IBM Selectric typewriter

From: Delndre Moors
Sent: Thursday, August 6, 2020 2:57 PM
To: Dan Jones <Dan.Jones@edmontonpolice.ca>
Cc: d'aoustf@ottawapolice.ca; Bender, Alex <BenderA@ottawapolice.ca>
Subject: Police Corruption || RE: Follow-up || FW: Gunshots || FW: Additional Criminals || FW: (re-sent with explained) Urgent || FW: Clarification || RE: Regarding your choice to refuse assistance: RCMP or CSIS
Importance: High

I am currently residing in Ottawa; however, I am hiding in the United States because of "The Ottawa Pipeline" (http://pfr.rocks/living/exposes/00000001_the-ottawa-pipeline-taxpayer-funded_sagotu002/) which includes multiple members of Ottawa Police Services. I suspect some are undercover agents while others are not*; I have no idea which is which. All I know is that I have been targeted by (at least one) international terrorist organization. Why not reach out to colleagues at Ontario Provincial Police, RCMP and CSIS? It cannot be that difficult to have these criminals apprehended under Ontario's *Mental Health Act*.

Who can protect my children whom are still in Ottawa? Crimes by the Children's Aid Society of Ottawa (to assist Jonathan Kiska in his multiple crimes against me is viewable here: <http://pfr.rocks/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/0000862-1.pdf>).

(20200827)

Hackers prevented me from finding work, my car was stolen, threats meant I have to leave the country and when I returned, my house was emptied of its contents (\$500,000) and the police refused to help because they are part of it, as are local lawyers, prosecutors and judges. I spent three months in prison though committed no crime. They kidnapped my children and stole everything that I own, including my dog and my cat. The bank is involved and they will not let me access my own savings.

They apply Technology-assisted Stalking & Harassment ("TASH") techniques (<http://pfi.rocks/website-content/tash/>), Pyranha-inspired Stalking & Harassment ("PFIISH") techniques (<http://pfi.rocks/website-content/pfish/>) and in many cases their ultimate goal is to drive one to suicide.

It is basically pre-mediated murder in the wickedest of ways

(20200827) Answer to question (they let you post here but they do not let you get a job for two years?

No, there were different periods with different types of "GSI" (Gang Stalk International).

From December 2016 to December 2018, I could not get contract or job to save my life: and, I have an incredibly strong c.v. Then, in January 2019, I got a very small contract with the Department of Justice* (Canada) to finish the build-out of some criminal conviction/appeal tracking database. It was the weirdest of contracts: they hired me because I am an MS Excel guru; however, whichever consultant came before me, built the so-called database using MS Word! The whole project was completely whacked and made absolutely no sense. The manager was pressuring me to finish it ASAP but I did not want my name attached to any of it. (The output of said database was to go to the Minister of Justice.) So, I drafted a proper project plan, told them that they needed to start over and I quit. (I have quit a lot of jobs/contracts. As a former Chartered Financial Analyst, individuals have enjoyed hiring me to do their dirty work for them: I do not.***) They could call me with a new contract if they were interested.

Next thing I know, I was GSI'd to a hotel where my car was stolen/impounded and then I was on a train out of town, winding up in a Kingston hotel dining room working on my laptop. An hour later, there were but four, individual "business people" in the dining room just working on their laptops.

The following month: the short version is that I was falsely accused of "Flight from Peace Officer" a few hours before my hearing to get my kids back. Provincial police dropped charges and released me. But the federal officer who stopped me in the first place brought me to a different station to have me re-arrested. Duty counsel, which I refused, spoke at my hearing regardless and accused me of mental illness. So, judge shipped me off to Suroit Hospital's psych ward where I met crooked psychiatrist, Paule