

NOTICE OF APPEAL TO AN APPELLATE COURT

BETWEEN

Deirdre Moore
and
Ottawa Police Services Board

NOTICE OF APPEAL

THE APPELLANT, Deirdre Moore, APPEALS to the Court of Appeal from the judgment of Justice Kerry Lee McVey dated January 27, 2025 made at the Superior Court of Justice in Ottawa, Ontario.

THE APPELLANT ASKS that the judgment be set aside and a judgment be granted as follows:

1. An Order dismissing the order which states "should Deirdre Moore file material seeking to commence or continue a proceeding or any appeal in any court in Ontario without first filing an entered Order permitting her to do so, the proceeding shall be immediately stayed upon any person filing a copy of this Order in such a Court".
2. An Order dismissing the order for costs awarded against Deirdre Moore ("Whistleblower")
3. An Order for a Summary Judgment against the Ottawa Police Services Board ("TIPCU") as requested in Whistleblower's CV-21-00087056
4. An Order for costs on a full-indemnity basis.

THE GROUNDS OF APPEAL are as follows:

1. The judge erred in fact. For example, while each of Her Honour's sentences contained in her 20250127 decision ("Ruling") at paragraph (5) were "technically correct", the lack of acknowledgement of the seven Motions which occurred throughout 2023

render the paragraph—as a whole—an entirely false statement of fact.

The seven Motions included an attempt to obtain Third-party Records ("TPRs") from TIPCUP which is normally a part of an Affidavit of Documents and/or a Discovery process. Vexatious (and criminal) behaviour by TIPCUP's legal representatives at Borden Ladner Gervais LLP, however, resulted in the denial of these records. Undeniable evidence of this fact was long-ago published at www.twb.rocks/the-darkumentary. An Errors, Omissions and Malicious Obfuscation Analysis (EO & MO") of Ruling will evidence that Justice Kerry Lee McVey's 20 (of the 35) paragraphs used to justify the Ruling's conclusion were false statements of fact.

2. The judge erred in law. For example, TIPCUP brought its vexatious Vexatious Application on 20230131 prior to amendments made to s. 140 of Ontario's *Courts of Justice Act* ("CJA") via the *Enhancing Access to Justice Act, 2024* ("EAJA"). The EAJA amendments were not retroactive and, therefore, shall not be relied upon for TIPCUP's CV-23-00091267. On 20250127, Her Honour erred by imposing the court's newly-expanded 2024 powers to TIPCUP's 2023 Application which, arguably, intentionally misquoted the then-existing legislation through its clearly poor use of grammar and/or punctuation ... perhaps to mislead the 2023-appointed judge.
3. The judge erred in mixed law and fact. For example, Her Honour's 2-sentence interpretation (at paragraph [16]) of her 7-point description of "the salient characteristics of vexatious proceedings" (at paragraph [15]) included only:

- a) that which TIPCU need not demonstrate and
- b) [un-evidenced] "outside the courtroom" conduct which the court may consider.

Her Honour ignored her own leading-case requirement noted in her paragraph [15]:

"(e) ... the Court must look at the whole history ..."

As stated in GROUNDS (item 1), exclusion by TIPCU of any reference to Whistleblower's seven 2023 Motions prevented the court from looking at "the whole history": scheduling its Application to be heard without Whistleblower's involvement ensured the court would remain ignorant of "the whole history".

THE BASIS OF THE APPELLATE COURT'S JURISDICTION is:

1. For reasons including, but not limited to, those discussed above under sub-headings "The judge erred in [fact, law and mixed law and fact]", despite Justice McVey's paragraph [36] points 2-5, Whistleblower's right to appeal Her Honour's Ruling falls within the jurisdiction of Ontario's Court of Appeal.
2. CJA's s. 134(1) states that "a court to which an appeal is taken may a) make any order or decision that ought to or could have been made by the court or tribunal appealed from
b) order a new trial
c) make any other order or decision that is considered just."
3. CJA's s. 134(2) states that "on Motion, a court ... may make any interim order that is considered just to prevent prejudice to a party pending the appeal"; and, Whistleblower intends to bring a Motion to Adduce Fresh Evidence.
4. CJA's s. 133 does not restrict Whistleblower's right to Appeal given Rulings paragraph [36] item 6 and paragraphs [37] - [41].
5. CJA's s. 134(5) empowers Ontario's Court of Appeal in a fashion similar to SCJ's "broad judicial powers" and/or OCJ's "broad sweeping powers".

6. Her Honour's Ruling is deemed to be a final Order.
7. Leave is not necessary for reasons including, but not limited to, those noted in GROUNDS (for Appeal) and BASIS (of jurisdiction)
8. Canada's Charter of Rights and Freedoms exists — despite all efforts made by Ottawa's legal-judicial community that it does not.
9. Ruling lacked jurisdiction in multiple ways including, but not limited to, its restriction of ~~Whistleblower's~~ ^{Whistleblower's} ~~Moore's~~ ability to commence Applications, Certiorari and/or Appeals in the Ontario Court of Justice and/or Superior Court of Justice for her ongoing criminal matters which are entirely due to:
 - a) her husband's false allegations; etc.,
 - b) TIPCUP's negligent investigations, etc. and
 - c) Ottawa's Crown Attorney's Office perpetual malicious prosecution.

The violations of Canada's Criminal Code ("ccc") by Ottawa-based criminal court judges and justices of the peace require those who stand accused to be in a position to access those alternative avenues to justice.

February 26, 2025

Deirdre Moore
Deirdre Moore

ascjak@outlook.com

Deirdre Moore and Ottawa Police Services Board

Deirdre Moore and Ottawa Police Services Board

ONTARIO

COURT OF APPEAL FOR ONTARIO

OSGOODE HALL

130 QUEEN STREET WEST, TORONTO, ONTARIO M5H 2N5

NOTICE OF APPEAL

Appellant

Deirdre Moore, 1244 Lampman Crescent, Ottawa, ON K2C 1P8*

- no current phone**
- current e-mail address ascjak@outlook.com

*However, if she goes home she will be re-arrested because her fraudster+ husband (see <https://twb.rocks/domestic-terrorism/perpetrators/individuals/john-kiska>) has yet to be:

- arrested by the Ottawa Police Services Board (“OPSB”),
- prosecuted by Ottawa’s Crown Attorney’s Office and
- convicted by the Ontario Court of Justice or Ontario’s Superior Court of Justice

** Following the kidnapping (as detailed at <https://twb.rocks/hsc-win> and <https://twb.rocks/upig/psych/population-control>) and harassment by Ontario Work-positioned individuals including, but not limited to, Jean Doyle (see <https://twb.rocks/domestic-terrorism/perpetrators/individuals/jean-doyle>), the re-acquisition of a phone number has been difficult.